

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, May, 1894.

TENNYSON'S "IN MEMORIAM."

"'In Memoriam' is rather the cry of the whole human race than mine. In the poem altogether private grief swells out into thought of, and hope for, the whole world. It begins with a funeral and ends with a marriage—begins with death and ends in promise of a new life—a sort of Divine Comedy cheerful at the close. . . . It is a very impersonal poem as well as personal."

These words of Tennyson furnish the point of view from which the accompanying matter-analysis of "In Memoriam" has been made. The poem is regarded as essentially a lyric. It tells of the great chastening sorrow of the poet's life; but in the poem the particular becomes the universal—a universal, however, in which the particular is absorbed, not destroyed. As Stopford Brooke says: Tennyson felt the loss of his friend: he felt the loss of all the friends of the whole world. The poem, notwithstanding many philosopher-critics to the contrary, is not a reasoned system of philosophy. Its subject is not an abstract, but a concrete one—the development of the poet's own character—and the result reached is a poetic, not a scientific one. The development is an organic growth, not a logical process.

The progress of the poem to the final result is marked by three well-defined stages; and the result is reached through six main streams of development—Feeling, Thought, Memories, Communion, Apologies and Dreams. Of these the most important is Feeling. The stages in the feeling are indicated by changes in Time and Place. Though the main result of the poem is essentially emotional, yet novelty is added by presenting a philosophical aspect of the grief. This line of development is indicated in the column designated Thought. The impelling cause of the poem is the desire for reunion with the lost friend: "Memories" serve as a comfort and inspiration to him until the desired communion is attained. The Apologetic-poems serve a double purpose: they are a defence of his song against different

classes of objectors; and also indicate transitions in the poem.

The "Dreams" are yet another class which forms an integral part of the organic development: In the first (iv), the poet sits "within a helmless bark," and looks vainly back to the dead Past for his friend. In the second (lxviii-lxxi), he sees "the divine thing in the gloom" of the Present. In the third (ciii), at the summons of his friend, he joins him on the Sea of Eternity. These dreams, or visions, indicate the onward movement and advance of the poem. The man rises from living in the past, through the present, upward to self-enfolding the large results of the glorious future. They are the mystic shadowingforth of the whole course of the poem.

PROLOGUE AND EPILOGUE.

"I trust he lives in Christ, and there
I find him worthier to be loved.

That friend of mine who lives in God,—
One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves."

These several lines of thought converge in the Prologue and Epilogue—the Prologue giving the result in its more personal, the Epilogue in its more universal or cosmic aspect. In these the

"answer is given to the problem of sorrow for the loss of those we love—to the cry of the breaking heart all over the world—immortal life in God who is immortal love, and, therefore, immortal life; immortal development—immortal union with all we love; the never-ending evolution of all into more and more of perfection."

The universe—past, present and future—becomes to the poet a seamless robe woven in the loom of Love.

An analysis of any poem can but serve as a word along the way. Poetry speaks best for itself. An idea of the true *poetic* unity of "In Memoriam"—its symmetry and beauty—can be gained only from a diligent and sympathetic study of the poem itself.

ANALYSIS OF "IN MEMORIAM."

"A grief, then changed to something else."

	FEELING.	THOUGHT.	MEMORIES.	COMMUNION.	CHORUS-POEMS.	DREAMS.
	TIME. PLACE.					
	I-xx. The Shock. Yew tree ii.				The ministry of Song. v. viii.	iv.
	Arthur's home vii. ix-xvii. The bringing home. The grave xviii. xxi-xxvii. Love and Loss.			vi-xvii. Parted	xix-xxi. xxxviii.	
The Present in the Past. "To know the change and feel it, When there is none to heal it Nor numb'd sense to steal it, Was never said in rhyme."	xxviii-xxx. Sorrow touched with Joy. xxviii-xxx. Christmas. xxxviii-xxxix. Spring. Yew tree xxxix.	xxxix-xxxvi. Is my friend immortal? Answer of Love and Revelation. xli-xxvii. Has he individuality?	xxii-xxv. That fair friendship.	xxii-xxvii. The bond of Memory.	Subject of the Song. xxxvii. xlviii-xlix. A nobler Song.	
	I-lxxi. Love and Faith	lii-lvi. Nature's Reply—Faith's Protest.		l-iii. Am I worthy? lx-lxii. His diviner sphere lxiii-lxiv. My low estate. lxv. Love's solace.	lvii-lix. Love the Motive. lxxiii-lxxvii.	lxviii-lxxi.
	lxxii-clii. Peace and Hope lxxii. Anniversary. lxxviii. Christmas. lxxxiii. New Year.			lxxix-lxxxii. The voice that is still.	lxxxviii. A "secret joy."	
The Past in the Present. "Love's not Time's fool."	lxxxvi. Spring. xcix. Anniversary. c-clii. Leaving home.		lxxxiv-lxxxix. The flowery walk of letters xcv-clii. His stronger faith	xc-xciv. Spirit, Come!		ciii.
	civ-cxxxi. A Glorious Hope civ-cv. Christmas. cvi. New Year. cvii. Anniversary.	cxviii-cxx. Man the crowning work of Time.	cix-cxiv. His sweet perfection.			
The Future in the Present. "Ring in the Christ that is to be."	cxv. Spring. Arthur's Home cxix.	cxxiv. "By faith alone."		cxlii-cxxiii. Re-united.	cxv. "Love breathed the song."	
	Hope and Love.	cxvii-cxxviii. "All is well."		cxxiv-cxxxi. Full communion.		

ARTHUR BEATTY,
JNO. A. MACVANNEL.

ENG. LUNG: GR. γλωσσα: LINGUISTIC CONSERVATION OF ENERGY.

No satisfactory explanation of Grk. γλωσσα has been made. It has a distinct congener in γλωχιν 'a projecting point' < 'tongue.' We can then reconstruct for these words a Greek stem-background *γλωχ-.

Still another group of Greek words clusters in λιχμάω 'lick out the tongue.' For this we can assume a stem *λιχ-.

Can we bring these two stems together? By doing so we arrive at a root *ǵligh- with a by-form *ligh-, arising in certain syntactical collocations.

In the *√ligh we have a perfectly well-known Aryan root. Its belongings may be found in Prellwitz 'Et. Wort. d. Gr. Spr.', s.v. λείχω.

Kluge, s. v. Zunge (Davis's translation), remarks that "Zunge should be lit. 'that which licks.'" This is the sense we find by the above grouping.

The vocalisation of γλωσσα is, so far as its root-syllable is concerned, *ǵligh-.

Greek offers another parallel to this formation. Σπλάγχνα, 'in'ards, spleen' derive from a stem *spligh- as Sk. plīhan, Lat. lien 'spleen' show. In σπλάγχνα and σπλήν the ε-vowel of the root has been lost, and in σπλάγχνα we have a stem σπλχ-. The same thing is seen in γλωχιν < *√ǵligh-. The explanation seems to me to be that a highly sonant and vibrant l won over the weakly sonant-λ.

We reach now the conception of a √ǵligh|ligh 'lick.'

To this root we may refer Greek γλίσσεται 'desire eagerly' < 'pant for.' Γλίσσος, 1. 'sticky' 2. 'gloating'; for example, γλίσσος

1 Prof. Collitz, of Bryn Mawr, is about to publish an etymology of γλωσσα, in which he too reaches the base ǵligh. It happened that when Prof. Collitz mentioned his etymology to Prof. Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins, he already knew of mine, communicated to him and Prof. Gildersleeve in the Spring or Winter of 1893. Prof. Collitz and I agreed that we should each publish our work, knowing nothing of the other's except that we both refer γλωσσα to a base ǵligh.

βλέπειν 'to look gloating': that is, 'panting,' 3. 'greedy' < *γλίσσος(?) or < γλίσσ+σν+ρο- (cf. Lat. posco > porc-sco: proc-us but see Brug. 'Gr.' ii, §1030).

Hesychius furnishes us with still another member of this group γλίσσος φειδωλός καὶ γλίσσος, οἱ δὲ πολυπράγμων, περιεργός 'busy-body' the 'man o' the tongue.'

How does this root appear in Sanskrit? Besides the √lih|rih is a root laid down by Whitney as √jeh, but probably to be laid down as √jih. Whitney defines √jeh as 'loll,' 'pant'; jihmā- of the 'darting' of the eye is correspondent to λιχμάω of the 'darting' of the tongue.

How do we explain the forms jihvā 'tongue,' √jeh 'pant,' jihmā 'darting'? They should appear as *jlih-. The first possibility of explanation is that beside the forms of ǵligh|ligh there grew up forms in jih| by a process the opposite of syncretism. But another explanation is this, *jlihvā was felt to be in relation to √hvā 'call,' and became jihvā by popular etymology as a reduplication of √hvā. This occurred in the Indo-Iranian period, whence Avestan hizva: jihmā- and √jeh followed the lead of jihvā-.

Lat. ligula 'skimmer, spoon' got its name perhaps from its tongue-shape. So in Sk. juhū 'tongue,' 'flame-tongue,' 'ladle' we are to see a popular association with √hu sacrifice. Juhū was specifically the 'sacrifice ladle'; German Löffel is perhaps to be connected with Leber, cf. infra.

The Lat. word lingua 'tongue' we must now explain out of *ǵlingua. What becomes then of the form dingua reported as Old Latin? It is a sometime affection from Lat. dens 'tooth.' The tongue and teeth are certainly contiguous parts of the body. I accept very cheerfully Bloomfield's explanation of πούς as affected in its vocalisation by ὀδούς (Am. Jour. of Phil. xii, p. 2f.), and I add to the same group οὖς 'ear' (cf. Lat. auris), and possibly οὐδάρ 'udder' (cf. Sk. ūdhar) was helped to its orthography in the same manner. The question is one of orthography after all, not of phonology. The element of orthography must be considered in language study. Certainly,

Homer and the Vedas were submitted to the minutest grammatical handling. Altogether unwarranted by any known language conditions is the assumption that Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, Gothic and so on, employed but one letter to represent one sound, and that one letter always represented the same sound.

Latin has a large group of congeners of this root. First I note *limus* 'darting sidewise' (of the eyes)=Sk. *jehmā*—same meaning. *Lividus* 'bruised,' *livor* 'a bruise' are further congeners; *lividus* meant 'licked.' The words derive from an animal's licking hurts and sores on the young. A mother of the human species still kisses (licks) a child's hurt to make it well. *Lividus* I define by 'licked.' It is a ptc. (cf. my explanation of *splendidus*, *Am. Jour. Phil.*, vol. xiii, p. 475) to *-liviscor* in *obliviscor*, which means to 'lick over.' The term may have originated from very early picture writing before the close of the Aryan period. I am not able to suggest any representatives of this meaning in other languages.

We may write for the Latin root of *ob-liviscor* **liv-*; a comparison of *jihvā* and *lingua* enables us then to reconstruct <**liḡhw-*.

Is Lat. *littera* 'letter' a result of popular etymology? if *obliviscor* meant to 'lick over,' 'erase,' 'forget,' then in the decomposite *littera* we have perhaps that which was 'licked over,' and 'erased,' Hom. 'Il.' 6, 169 γράφας ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῶ, etc., seems to vouch for very early writing, whether word-writing or picture-writing is immaterial. The Assyrian tablets show a knowledge of writing in a much remoter antiquity, and we can hardly doubt that this knowledge was caught up by the non-semitic and contiguous Aryan peoples, perhaps even before the breaking up of the Aryan people. The relation of *li-te-ra* to its root *liv-* is that of *vi-ta-* to its root *viv-*.

Ob-li-no 'lick over' is possibly a new-made present after such an analogy as *situs*: *sino*=*ob-li-tus*: *oblino*; note also *siv-i* and *liv-i*.

Further Latin forms that may be assigned to Aryan **ḡliḡh-* 'lick,' are *limax* 'snail' *limus* 'slime' and *sa-liv-a* 'spittle,' used also of the slime of slugs and snails. In *saliva* we have possibly a popular association with *sal* 'salt,' suggested because of the slight saltiness of the saliva itself, or because salt makes

a marked flow of saliva. It is possible that *saliva* is <**syn-liv-a* (cf. my forthcoming studies in Agglutination of a discussion of the phonetics involved).

We are now able to make a better definition of *limare*; the idiom *limare caput cum aliquo* (Pl. 'Merc.' 3, 1, 40; 'Poen.' 1, 2, 82) is defined, incorrectly perhaps, as 'kiss' <'rub' (L. & S., s. v., 1 B. 2.). If the sense in those passages is not sexual an easier derivation is <'lick.' In such phrases as *stilus ornat ac limat* ('Cic., de Or.', 3, 49, 190) we see a trace of the meaning 'erase' in *oblino*, *obliviscor* (*supra*). In *lima* 'file,' *limāre* 'to file' we have the characteristic motion of λιχμαῖω 'dart out the tongue.'

Limus a 'purple-trimmed girdle or apron,' and *limbus* 'fringe, belt' probably got their meaning from tongue-shaped pinked, or embroidered escallops. *Limbus* is in the same phonetic category as *ambulare* in whose *-mb-* Bugge (Bezz. Beitr. xiv, p. 62) sees -ηδ-, comparing ἄγγελος.

Lambo 'lick' is for **ḡliḡhw*, and λαφύσσω 'swallow greedily' can be brought into the same group. It is hard though to separate λαφύσσω from Sk. *jṛmbhate* 'open the mouth wide,' 'yawn.' Perhaps we are to assume with Hillebrandt (in a recent number of KZ.) that the velars exhibit occasional labialisation in Sanskrit. Note also, *jāmbhaka* 'swallowing.'

The old Latin *clingere* belongs, perhaps, to this group being an orthographic confusion for **ḡlingere*. According to the Lexicon of Forcellini (Corradini) the following explanations of *clingo* have been offered: Paul, 'Diac.' p. 56. 13.

Müll. *clingere*, *cingere* a Graeco κυκλοῦν dici manifestum est. Al. leg. a Graeco κλείειν quod est claudere. Sic in Gloss. Isid. *clingit cludit*. Voss tamen in Etymol. magis placet ut *clingere* sit crebro corporis motu imitare motacillam <'waggletail'> quae κικυλός dicitur, quia in uno MS. Paul. Diac. pro κλείειν invenit κικλείν, et in aliis κικυλίζειν.

We saw above that *limbus* 'fringe' and *limus* 'a purple-trimmed belt' were derivatives of **ḡliḡh-*. *Limus* is defined by Serv., 'ad Verg. Aen.', 12. 120, Haec autem vestis in extremo sui purpuram limam, id est, flexuosam habit, unde et nomen accepit. Now if in *cingulum* 'girdle' for **clingulum* (as *cingere* for *clingere*)

we see the same sematology as above in *limbus*, *limus*, then in *cinctus* we are to see a participle to a noun **cingus*, **clingus* 'girdle.' From *cinctus* a verb was created like *vinxi*, *vincio*: *vinculus* 'bound,' *cingo* retained its *g* because of *cingulum*.

Glisco, I also refer to this group <g> *gligh-sco*. According to Servius on Vergil 'Aen.,' 129: "adhibebant praecipue de incremento ignis." We speak in the same metaphor of "tongues of flame," and "licking flames." In Stat. Th., 1.107 sanie gliscit cutis we have the sense of *livor* 'bruise': the skin is sticky, smeared with gore.' In Col. 7.1.1. asellus paleis gliscit 'the ass devours straw' we have the same development of meaning as in Grk. *λαφύσσω*. In Plautus, 'Capt.,' 3.4.26 gliscit rabies expresses the same idea as vs. 18 *ét illic isti qui insputatur mórbus interdúm venit*—the epileptic's foaming at the mouth, cf. *saliv-a* as explained above. *Gliscere* also means 'pant' 'ardently long for' like *γλίχ-ομαι* explained above.

I now turn to the Slavic forms of this group, and first O. Bulg. *j-ęzykŭ* 'tongue.' We might have expected **zezykŭ*, like *jihvā* or **lezykŭ*, like Lith. *lėžuvis*. Why this unlooked-for form? Certainly Bezzenberger's explanation (*Beitr.* iii, p. 134f.) when he weakens his supposed *√dengh*: *dugh*, and then drops the *d* comparing O. Bulg. *bŭna* <**bŭdna* does not satisfy in any case, for there is no real warrant for weakening the root to that form (cf. *infra* Goth. *tuggo*).

I believe that in *językŭ* we have an affection from *jetro* 'liver,' *jedro* 'testiculus.' That tongue and liver should affect one another is on *a-priori* grounds plausible enough: they have a general likeness in appearance, and are both edible inmeats. A comparison of 'Il.' 1.457-374 with 'Od.' 3.332-344 shows a substantially similar employment of *γλωσσα* 'tongue' and *σπλάγχα* 'haslet' in the sacrificial feast. (Cf. Stengel in Iw. Müller's 'Handbuch' v, 3, p. 79.)

A step further seems to bring us now to the etymology of Aryan *je-kr-* <*t*> 'liver.' Grk. *ἥπαρ* was used for the seat of the affections, and as a mortal part of the body. This use is foreign to Sk. *yákr̥t*- and seems to be late in Latin, and, probably, due to Greek influence.

The similar use of the term *liver* in the early English ballads (lamented by the poet Watson in his Introduction to 'Lyric Love') may also be set down to Renaissance influence. Beside *ἥπαρ* Greek has *ἥτορ* 'heart,' used by Homer in the sense of *καρδία*, but located at 'Il.' 20.169 *ἐν καρδίῃ* (bosom?); I explain *ἥτορ* for *ἥτορ*, and make it a by-form with dentalisation of the so-called 'Velar.'

The loss of the rough breathing in *ἥτορ* is explained by the grammatical handling of the poems. This dead word (imitated from Epic by Simonides, Pindar and Aeschylus) was brought into connection with *ἥτρον* 'abdomen.'

Homer also uses for 'heart' *κῆρ*, Gen. *κηρός*, and *καρδίη*; and *ἥπαρ* as the seat of kindly feelings, and the seat of life, we ought to define, like *ἥτορ*, as 'heart.'

The beating of the heart in times of excitement must have been a primeval perception in man and particularly in woman. This is attested by Hom. 'Il.,' 10.94. *Καρδίη δέ μοι ἔξω στήθεος ἐκσπρώσκει*. Doubtless, from this

2 Prellwitz 'Et. Wort. d. Gr. Spr.' separates *ἥτρον* 'abdomen' from *ἥτριον* 'warp.' In this I cannot follow him. We have the same sematology in O. Bulg. *jadro* (1) sail, *jadro* (2) fold of a garment (Lat. *sinus*), and in a modern Slavic language 'great net' (cf. Mikl., 'Et. Wort.' s. v.). The same sematological conditions obtain in Latin *sinus*, which I connect with Eng. *sinew*. The earliest usage of *sinus* seems to be of the bag of a net, made stronger, presumably, than the outer parts, that is to say, made of sinews. From this bag-shape were the words extended to the belying sail, and to a fold in a garment.

The words grouping about German *ader* (cf. Kluge, s. v.) mean 'sinew, vein,' but also 'bowels.'

Returning to the Greek forms *ἥτριον* 'warp,' *ἥτρον* 'abdomen,' we see that they can be united about the notion 'sinew.' Does Greek furnish another congener? Yes, in *ἔσειραι* 'horse-tail crests,' 'hair,' and in the Hom. 1π. λεγ, ἁλώην-ἔσειρη, Φα 347, which, when compared with 'Orph. Arg.' 932 χρυσέαις φολιδέσσιν ἔσειρεται, 'he is covered with golden scales,' seems to mean 'gather in the harvest' (into bags) or 'bind the harvest' (for the threshing floor).

From these considerations a connection between *ἔσειραι*, Slav. *jadro*, Germ. *ader* seems every way justified. In that case in the play of influences between an **ηδρο*, 'abdomen,' and **ἥτορ* 'heart' the resultant was *ἥτορ* and *ἥτρον*, and back of the diminutive *ἥτριον* 'warp' an **ἥτρον* 'warp' would lie.

The so prevalent sematology represented in this group seems to repeat itself in *ve-lum* 'sail' and *ve-na* 'vein.'

We may infer that this Sematology was European, if not Aryan.

physiological fact came the location of the feelings in the heart.

The chase and war gave evidence that the heart was the seat of life, cf. 'R.V.' I.24.8 *hrdayāvīdh-* 'piercing the heart.'

The Aryans had located the seat of love in the heart. This is shown by a comparison of Sk. *crāddhita-* Lat. *crēditus*, and Grk. *χρηστός* (not in Homer) 'trusted,' 'trusty,' cf. Lat. *creditor*: *χρήστηρ* 'creditor.' In *χρηστός* we have transfer of aspiration from *κρηθ+τρο-< κρηθ+τρο*, cf. the Sk. ptc. to *dā, oṭta*, (Wh., 955 f.). No argument can be brought against this from Homer's not using *χρηστός*, for he had *πιστός* 'trusty' in the same metrical and notional value.³ I explain, therefore, Greek *ἡπαρ, ἥτορ*, as 'heart- *par excellence*' <'the heart': *κῆρ* 'heart.' In Sk. *yā-kṛt*, Lat. *je-cur* we have the definite article *ye-* Grk. dem. *ὄς*. This use of *ya-* is well-known in Avestan and Sanskrit.

The long quantity of *ἡπαρ* is due to *ἥτορ*, cf. O.H.G. *ādara* (Kluge, s. v. *ader*), and we have seen how *ἥτορ* has been affected by *ἥτρον*.

English is full of warrant for the attachment of the article to the noun, and conversely of the detachment of initial consonants from the noun. I cite for the nonce=for then once, tother=the+tother out of that other. C. P. G. Scott (in *Trans. Am. Phil. Soc.* for 1892) has brought together 161 cases like a *newt* for an *ewt*, and thirty-one cases like an *adder* for a *nadder*. Hopkins, *Proc. Am. Or. Soc.*, 1892, p. clxxvi, has brought together a conclusive statistic for the comparison of Sk. *āhar* with Germ. *tag*, by showing that it is prevailingly preceded by *yād, tad*, etc., thus *yād āhar* is for *yād dāhar*. This we are to conceive, perhaps, as **ya-da-har*. We have a similar phenomenon in *σήμερον, τήμερον* (out of *syē|| tyē*), and in *hō-die*, 'to-day.' Possibly, we are to explain *ἡμέρα* as **ἡ-μερα* (out of *sēo*), 'the clear (of the day).' We could then equate with it *meri-dies* and compare *merenda* 'an

³ Brugmann ('Gr.' i, §507 rejects *crēditus=crād-dhita*, because of the tmesis of *crad+dhā*, but that only implies the analogy of *crād-dhita* with *ā-hita*, etc. O. Ir. *cretim* seems capable of explanation in the same way as Grk. *χρηστός*. Its pret. act. 3d sg. *ro-chreit* is formally just what the pass. would be (cf. Wind., 'Ir. Gram.', §§265, 324), represents, that is to say, the ptc. in *-to-* (cf. Brug., 'Gr.' ii, §79), that is, *cret < cred+to*.

afternoon feast.' J. Schmidt's comparison of Germ. *sommer* (cf. Kluge, s.v.) gains in point by this definition. Comparable also, is *ἡμερος* a 'domesticated (serving) animal' with *mereo* 'serve.'

The objection remains that Sk. *crad-* shows a palatal, and *yā-kṛt* a velar. But this difficulty arises on many sides (Brug., 'Gr.' i, §467). Bezenberger in his *Beiträge* (vol. xvi, p. 234 f.) has offered a solution by setting up a third guttural row to catch the exceptions from the other two. A less complicated statement will be that our Aryan savage ancestors did not uniformly develop their *single* guttural series into palatals and velars, and among their other fetishes they did not have one entitled the *Inviolability of Phonetic Law*.

More like the tongue in color than the liver are the lungs. That liver and lungs are very closely associated any one will be willing to admit. They are associated in the compound terms *σπλάγχνα, viscera*, 'haslet.' I cite from the Ancient Ballad of Chevy Chase vss. 49-50.

"Thoroue lyvar and longs bathe
The sharp arrowe ys gane."

In the Modern Slavic languages *jentro* 'liver' in combination with adjectives meaning 'soft,' 'white' (cf. Miklosich, 'Etym. Wört.', s. v. *jentro*) means 'lungs.' So Eng. 'lights' has come out of the phrase *light liver*. Ger. *die leichte leber*.

In Goth. *tuggo* 'tongue' we have the same affection from *tunthus* 'tooth' as in the Latin *dingua* to *dens*. Did Germanic retain the form *lu(g)go* lying back of the analogical form *tuggo*? It did, and in a sematology already witnessed in the discussion of O. Bulg. *językū*. The common Germanic word of which Eng. 'lung' is a representative has in Gothic the reconstructed form **luggo* (cf. Kluge, s. v. *lunge*).

In this preservation of 'lung' in a special sense we have a most satisfactory evidence of adaptation to new senses of previously existing material, and this I would call Linguistic Conservation of Energy.

We are now able to see the reason of German *leber* beside Lat. *jecur*. The *l* derives, not from Joh. Schmidt's *lyēk*, etc., but is picked up from *'lunge'* (cf. 'lyvar and longs') above cited; alliteration, of course, had a hand

in this. But we can go farther than this in the explanation of *leber*. Kluge, s. v., gives a Germanic *l̥*-vowel, and this **lib-* may derive from *liḡhw-*, and its *-r* suffix be a remnant of the old lost word for 'liver' corresponding to Lat. *jecur*. This treatment of *ḡhw|ḡh* is seen also in Ger. *abend*; Eng. even-(ing): Sk. ahan-'day' (cf. *supra*). We have a similar treatment of *-b-* in Ger. *Eben*, Eng. *even*: Lat. *aequus*. The gradation is *álai*.

If we may regard German *lende* 'loins' as borrowed from Slavic we have an explanation to our hands for O. Bulg. *lēdwī* as a bit of conservation and adaptation. *Lēdwī* means 'kidneys,' 'loins.' If the association of liver, lungs, heart and kidneys in the haslet with the tongue as a generally similar and edible in-meat be a natural one, so we might expect 'kidneys' to be linguistically corrected with 'tongue.' The nasalisation in *lēdwī* may have been the first stage in the affection of the early Slavic representation of *liḡh*; and *-dwī* for **gwī* is possibly an affection from *jēdro* 'testiculus,' *jetro* 'liver.' In Lat. *lumbi* 'loins,' 'genital organs,' we have, perhaps, the same development of meaning. For the group *-mb-* cf. *lambo* above.

I note, finally, that in O. Bulg. *jetro* we have, perhaps, the original Aryan word for liver. From Sk. *yákrt* Gen. *yaknás*, Gr. Gen. *ἥπατος*, we can assume an early Slavic *jekn-t-* and a *je-kr*. These, by contamination, would result in a stem *jētr-*. Cf. Lat. *jecinoris*. Miklosich, s. v., refers the form to Gr. *ἐντερον* 'in'ards,' as a borrowing.

Perhaps, O. Bulg. *līgati* 'lie,' ought to be referred to *liḡhw- <(g)ḡhw*. We might then explain Gothic *lugum* 'we lied,' *lugans* 'lying' as borrowed words, to which the forms *liugan*, etc., have been analogically created. The sematology involved is that of Germ. *Zungeln* defined by Sander's Wört., s. v.: Schlangenhaft falsch sein und wirken, nam: von einer hinter scheinbarer Harmlosigkeit sich bewegendenden lauernden Bosheit. The much-talked-of Euripidean line, 'Hipp.' 612:

ἡ γλώσσ' ὁμώμοχ' ἢ δὲ φρήν ἀνώμοτος,

is commonly warped to this sense. English two-tongued may also be brought in evidence, and Sk. *jihmá-* means 'false,' 'treacherous.'

For the *√ḡliḡh* it seems as if we could almost go back to its physiological origin. The tongue makes no more characteristic noise than the implosive sound produced by fitting the tongue close to the palate, and then drawing it very suddenly down. I have made the sound for a number of people and have asked them to pronounce it. The invariable answer has been 'click.' The Aryan explosive rendering of this implosive sound was *ḡliḡh*. The meaning 'lick' was subsequent to 'tongue.' I attempt to bridge the connection of noun and verb in my studies in Agglutination which will be summarized in the *Proceedings of the Am. Or. Soc.* for 1894.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Washington and Lee Univ.

"EARTH UPON EARTH."

THE stanzas published by Dr. W. P. Reeves under the title "Earth upon Earth" in MOD. LANG. NOTES for April (ix, 204) consist of two distinct documents: (1) the poem "Earth upon Earth" (seven stanzas, twenty-eight verses), and (2) the lines "Whoo soo hym bethowght," etc. (vv. 29-31 in Dr. Reeves's numbering).

The second of these documents was long ago published by Thomas Wright, 'Rel. Ant.,' i, 235-236 (repeated in Mätzner, 'Altengl. Sprachpr., Poesie,' p. 51). *Bede* in Dr. Reeves's text is not "prayer," as he interprets it, but a bad form for *bedde*. In several other particulars Wright's text (Arundel MS. 292) furnishes better readings than those of the Stratford scroll. A similar scrap is in 'Rel. Ant.' i, 160.

The poem "Earth upon Earth" has been several times published. The Stratford text is given by Longfellow (apparently from R. B. Wheler, 'History and Antiquities of Stratford-upon-Avon,' p. 98) in 'Outre-Mer' (Père

¹ See *Notes and Queries*, 3rd Ser., i, 389.

I have not seen Bateman's volume. The title-page, as given in the British Museum Catalogue, runs "The Five Wounds of Christ. A Poem. From an ancient Parchment Roll. By William Billyng. Manchester, 1814." The volume is a quarto and but forty copies were printed. Dr. Furnivall, with much probability, conjectures that Billyng was the copier not the author of "The Five Wounds" and the other pieces (including "Earth upon Earth") found in the roll (see his remarks in *Notes and Queries*, 4th Ser., iii, 103). As to the MS., which Bateman dates "about the reign of Henry V.," see Jewitt, *id.*, p. 229.

la Chaise, note). Another text was edited by William Bateman in 1814. From Bateman, Montgomery reprinted the poem in his 'Christian Poet,' 3d ed., p. 58 (see *Notes and Queries*, 1st Ser., viii, 110). Robert Thornton's MS. (about 1440) contains a version corresponding in general to the first five stanzas of the Stratford text. Thornton's copy has been twice printed (in Perry, 'Religious Pieces in Prose and Verse,' E. E. T. S., 1867, no. x, p. 95, and in the revised edition of the same, 1889, p. 96). A longer version consisting of twelve stanzas has been edited by Furnivall ('Hymns to the Virgin,' etc., E. E. T. S., 1867, pp. 88-90) from Lambeth MS. 853. The Lambeth version has all the Stratford stanzas. Parts of "Earth upon Earth" have been rather often utilized as epitaphs (see *Notes and Queries*, 1st Ser., vii, 577, viii, 575; 3rd Ser., i, 389, ii, 55; Milledulcia, 1857, p. 258).

A much older English poem on the same subject, with the corresponding Latin ("Terram per injuriam cum terra lucratur"), has been at least twice printed (from MS. Harl. 913),—by Wright, 'Rel. Ant.,' ii, 216-218; by Furnivall, 'Early English Poems and Lives of Saints,' Philol. Soc., 1862, pp. 150-152. There are some striking resemblances between this and "Earth upon Earth," and it is not improbable that the earlier poem inspired the later.

Of the three Latin leonines cited by Dr. Reeves (col. 205)—

Sede se[de]ns ista iudex inflexibilis sta
Sit tibi lucerna lex lux pellisque paterna
A manibus reuoces munus ab aure preces—

the following verses are evidently a translation:

ȝis² is ȝi sete, domes man,
ȝif rihtful dom ȝif ȝow kan;
Wiht ȝin hond tak ȝow no gifte,
Ne for biſekiug doi non unriht;
Lawe and lft is ȝi faderis fel,
Loke on ȝat and deme wel!
—'Rel. Ant.,' ii, 120 (from Harl. MS. 2316).

The second stanza of the Scottish poem printed by Dr. Reeves in col. 206 corresponds to st. i of the "Song" edited by Halliwell,

² For *p* Wright prints *ȝ* in his extracts from this manuscript.

'Rel. Ant.,' i, 56, from Harl. MS. 3810 (fifteenth century); cf. also 'Rel. Ant.' i, 233.

G. L. KITTRIDGE.

Harvard University.

(April 12, 1894.)

TEAT-YURE.

ONCE upon a time there was a school-mistress whose sense of humor had not been entirely destroyed by the necessity of posing five hours a day as an oracle. In a fit of disgust at the unthinking way in which "facts" are received and spread abroad, she turned suddenly upon her pupils—several of whom had for some time been brandishing their arms and calling, in a stage whisper, "Teacher, teacher"!—and said to them: "Now, children, which do you think is the right pronunciation, *teacher* or *teat-yure*?" And the class, with one voice, unhesitatingly responded: "Teat-yure!"

How could they answer otherwise? Had they not been carefully taught to say *nate-yure*, *fort-yune*, *ed-yucate*—clumsy combinations which they had never heard from any human being outside of the school-room? Were they not forced to the conclusion that the pronunciation which nobody ever uses is invariably the correct one? And, in point of fact, why is *teat-yure* so much worse than *feat-yure*? From the historical and the phonological standpoint one is as justifiable as the other; the two are equally harmonious; and, as for usage, the preference for *feacher*, among cultivated speakers, is scarcely less marked than the predilection for *teacher*.

A hundred years ago orthoepists really attached some importance to the practice of good speakers. Sheridan (1780), Walker (1791), and even Smart (1836) prescribe the *ch* sound in *feature*, *natural*, *nature*, *virtuous*, etc.; and Walker gives the *j* sound in *educate*. But later dictionary-makers have generally been inclined to follow their own arbitrary notions, or the vagaries of their colleagues, rather than the good examples they must have had about them. The best and most recent publications are not satisfactory in this respect. Murray purposely and confessedly gives the preference everywhere to the more artificial forms; the 'Century' dodges the question by

employing avowedly ambiguous symbols, and while the editor himself evidently likes the natural pronunciation best, the characters adopted tend rather to encourage the unnatural one; in the 'International' the phonetic notation is still more misleading, although the real sounds are clearly and accurately described in the introductory part of the volume.

Of all the senseless whims that orthoëpists have tried to impose upon a meek and gullible public, the pronunciations *ty*, *dy*, *sy*, *zy*, in cases like *nature*, *verdure*, *issue*, *pleasure*, are the most uncalled-for and the most contrary to the laws of human speech. The experience of many nations bears testimony to the fact that the groups *ty*, *dy*, *sy*, *zy* cannot be readily spoken, and tend to change either to simple sounds or to more homogeneous combinations. In English they have regularly become respectively *tʃ* (the *tch* in *butcher*), *dʒ* (the *dg* in *badger*), *ʃ* (the *sh* in *fisher*), *ʒ* (the *si* in *vision*). Thus *nature*, *verdure*, *issue*, *pleasure* are and have long been pronounced *nétʃə(r)*, *vë(r)-dʒə(r)*, *iʃù*, *plëʒə(r)*.¹ The forms *nëtyûr*, *vërdyûr*, *isyû*, *plezyûr* must have been originally either mere arbitrary creations of the would-be orthoëpist, or else ignorant misreadings of the printed words, akin to the childish *mizld* for *mised* and *ori* for *awry*.

In a few cases, to be sure, the artificial form has prevailed; but here the *y* is replaced by *i*, forming an additional syllable. *Beauteous*, *courteous*, *hideous*, *idiot*, *immediate* and *odious* are, in the United States, almost universally pronounced *byûtias*, *kë(r)tiäs*,² *hidias*, *idiät*, *imidiät*, *ôdias*. *Righteous*, on the other hand, is always *raitʃəs*. *Cordial* and *tedious* are generally *kə(r)dʒəl*, *tɪdʒəs*, but sometimes either *kə(r)dyəl*, *tɪdyəs* or *kə(r)diəl*, *tɪdiäs*. For *cordiality* there are four forms: *kə(r)diæliti*, *kə(r)dyæliti*, *kə(r)dʒæliti*, *kə(r)dʒiæliti*; the last is the usual one in this country, except in Pennsylvania (where the first apparently prevails) and in the states west of the Mississippi

¹ The phonetic characters used for vowels in this article are:—

ai=*i* in *kite*, *ê*=*a* in *fate*, *i*=*i* in *sit*, *o*=*aw* in *saw*,
æ=*a* in *hat*, *Û*=*u* in *hurt*, *î*=*ee* in *meet*, *u*=*oo* in *book*,
e=*e* in *set*, *ə*=*a* in *sofa*, *ô*=*o* in *rode*, *û*=*oo* in *moon*.

² *Kë(r)tyäs* is occasionally heard. *Këtʃəs* is not uncommon in the neighborhood of Boston.

(where all four seem to be common); the preference for *kə(r)dʒiæliti* is strongest in New England and New York, where *kə(r)diæliti* is scarcely ever heard (although it is not unusual elsewhere). This curious combination, *kə(r)dʒiæliti*, seems to be a compromise between the natural *kə(r)dʒæliti* and the artificial *kə(r)diæliti*: it is probably the last survivor of a whole series of compromise forms, such as *byûtʃias*, *hidʒias*, *imɪdʒiät*, *kërtʃias*, *kərdʒiäl*, *ôdʒias*, *raitʃias*, *tʃʒias* (given by Walker in 1791).³

The groups *ty*, *dy*, *sy*, *zy* are often formed by the combination of words in a phrase, such as *don't you know, did you, this year, as yet*. If the expression is a current one, the *y* and the preceding consonant are very often assimilated, although the unassimilated forms are much commoner here than in the body of a word. *Döntʃunô* and *didʒu* are, indeed, preferred by a large majority of cultivated speakers; but *ðisyiä(r)*, *əzyet* (probably with somewhat palatal *s* and *z*) seem to be more used than *ðiʃiä(r)*, *əʒet*.⁴ On the other hand, some persons who habitually pronounce *sen-syuäl*, *ëzyä(r)* unconsciously say *ðiʃiä(r)*, *əʒet*, their attention never having been called to these phrases.

The usage of highly educated American speakers (and principally that of college professors, students, and school-teachers) is shown to a certain extent in the answers to a circular sent out by me, as Secretary of the Phonetic Section, in November, 1893. There were just one hundred and fifty replies, representing seven states west of the Mississippi and all the states east of that river, except New Jersey, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama. The list of words and phrases submitted contained seven examples of *tʃ* or *ty*, six of *dʒ* or *dy*, three of *ʃ* or *sy*, and seven of *ʒ* or *zy*—twenty-three in all—without counting *cordiality*, *courteous*, *hideous*, and *immediate*, which have already been sufficiently discussed. The results will be found in the following table. The figures indicate the number *per centum* of speakers using *ty*, *dy*, *sy*, or *zy* in each case.

³ Sheridan (1780) has *byûtʃəs*, *kërtʃəs*, *raitʃəs*.

⁴ There are also forms *ðiʃiä(r)*, *eʒyet*, which are not uncommon.

	BOSTON (and vicinity).	NEW ENGLAND.	NEW YORK CITY.	NEW YORK STATE.	PENNSYLVANIA.	NORTH.	WEST.	SOUTH.
celestial	4	9	27	16	17	10	28	19
don't you know	16	17	54	16	50	30	28	11
fortune	12	13	36	16	33	15	28	7
furniture	8	17	27	24	33	20	7	19
natural	4	22	36	16	33	10	7	15
nature	4	17	27	16	33	15	14	7
question	12	9	9	16	50	5	21	0
cordial	8	13	27	8	50	15	50	22
did you	8	26	54	32	50	45	28	26
educate	12	30	36	24	50	15	7	7
gradual	20	26	18	16	50	5	28	15
soldier	8	9	9	0	17	5	0	11
verdure	12	17	27	16	50	5	28	11
issue	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	4
sensual	4	0	0	8	0	10	7	7
this year	39	70	73	46	67	60	57	60
as yet	57	61	73	54	83	75	65	60
azure	8	4	9	8	17	20	21	22
casual	16	9	9	24	50	40	14	37
glazier	8	0	9	32	33	20	35	19
it does you good	43	48	54	54	83	50	57	52
usual	12	17	0	24	50	35	21	26
visual	16	22	9	32	50	30	28	26

To obtain a rough estimate of the practice all over the United States, I have made a general average of the foregoing figures, giving, however, three times as much importance to the North as to any other division:—

WORDS.

PHRASES.

tʃ: 83½% ty: 16½% tʃ: 72% ty: 28%
dʒ: 82½% dy: 17½% dʒ: 64% dy: 36%
f: 97½% sy: 2½% f: 41% sy: 59%
ʒ: 77% zy: 23% ʒ: 41½% zy: 58½%

The difference in treatment between the sy and the zy series is noteworthy. Perhaps it would have been somewhat less striking if I had used the common words *pleasure* and *treasure*.

In drawing inferences from these percentages, we must bear in mind two facts: in the first place, the persons consulted were mostly teachers; and, secondly, my calculation is based on their own uncorroborated testimony.

I think it would be safe to say that if the whole body of educated speakers in our country could be examined, without knowing it, by competent phoneticians, the proportion of ty, dy, zy (and sy in phrases) would be considerably smaller than that shown in my tables. But even accepting the figures as they are, do they not justify us in demanding that the early education of our children be relieved of some of its unattractive and unnecessary *feat-yures*?

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Cambridge, Mass.

FRENCH PHONETICS.

I. EDUARD KOSCHWITZ: *Les parlers parisiens* d'après les témoignages de MM. de Bornier, Coppée, A. Daudet, Desjardins, Got, d'Hulst, le P. Hyacinthe, Leconte de Lisle, G. Paris, Renan, Rod, Sully-Prudhomme, Zola, et autres. *Anthologie phonétique*. xxxii, 147 pp. Paris-Leipzig: H. Welter, 1893. Price, fr. 4.50 (m. 3.60).

THE best and most interesting parts of this valuable publication seem to me to be the introduction (thirty pages), and the notes preceding every phonetic text, informing the reader about the life and birthplace of nearly every one of Mr. Koschwitz's authorities, recording a few remarkable features of individual utterance and pronunciation, and stating exactly the time when, the manner in which, and the particular circumstances under which, his authorities—the different writers, poets, scholars, orators, and actors—happened to present themselves to him as subjects of phonetic observation. The learned professor of Romance philology at the University of Greifswald begins his introduction by quoting the well-known verses of the Artesian *trouvère* of the twelfth century, Quene de Bethune:

Por çou j'ai mais mon chanter en defois,
Que mon langage ont blasmé li François,
Et mes chansons, oiant les Champenois
Et la contesse, encor dont plus me poise,
La roïne ne fist pas ke courtoise,
Qui me reprist, elle et ses fuis li rois;
Encor ne soit ma parole françoise.
Si la puet on bien entendre en François.
Ne cil ne sont bien apris ne cortois
Qui m'ont repris, se j'ai dit mot d'Artois,
Car je ne fui par norriz a Pontoise.

Starting from this significant and remarkably early linguistic document, he gives us a concise and instructive sketch of the history of *le français de l'Ile-de-France*, gaining more and more importance in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and already recognized, without question, as the national language of the whole country in the fifteenth century, and of what was, and is, called *le bon usage* of this national French in regard to syntax, vocabulary and pronunciation—the ideal of teachers, grammarians, and lexicographers since the sixteenth century. *Le bon usage*, in syntax and vocabulary, became comparatively uniform and fixed very early in consequence of the art of printing, the sedulous work of linguistic theorists and theorizing authors, the French Academy, and the long classical period of French literature. These causes naturally had much effect also on pronunciation; they were supplemented by the powerful influence of a strong political centralization, and a great national capital containing a large population whose vernacular was, and is, very similar to the literary French on account of its origin. In truth, the *bon usage*, even in matters of pronunciation, has reached among the educated classes of France, in and outside of Paris, a higher degree of unity and stability than the national or literary language of any other country. Pronunciation, however, is more delicate, more flexible, more exposed to the centrifugal influence of dialectic, provincial and individual tendencies and, consequently, at the same time less easy to be controlled and regulated by the reason and will of man than the syntax and vocabulary of a living language. The latter, as is proved by the example of France, can be kept under an extraordinarily strict discipline and, seemingly at least, preserved almost intact for a considerable length of time by grammars and dictionaries, by an official orthography and traditional instruction, by the unyielding admiration and conscious imitation of unsurpassed models of numerous excellent classical writers.

The stability of the French written and spoken by the educated and learned classes has never been an absolute one, and if it appeared to be real in many respects for a long time after the classical period, even such an

apparent and relative stability did not outlive the beginning of the nineteenth century. We have witnessed, and are still witnessing, a great many changes going on in the national language of contemporary France, brought about by various political, social, and literary causes; among these may be noted the destruction of monarchy and the old aristocracy, the cessation of court-life, the disorganization of the old 'polite' society, democratic institutions, universal school-instruction, the intellectual rise of the middle and lower classes, and new aspirations and tendencies in literature requiring new forms and methods of expression. Accordingly, the *bon usage* in syntax and vocabulary—which, once believed to be firmly established, possessed a pretty clear and definite meaning—is now getting unsettled and seems to be drifting into a state of great uncertainty and vagueness. No wonder, then, that the *bon usage* in pronunciation (which, for obvious reasons, has never been and could never be quite clearly defined) has become more and more dubious and problematical.

What is the *bon usage* in pronunciation, and where is it to be found? It is now more difficult than ever (at least since the seventeenth century) to answer satisfactorily this question, which, already in former times, was a matter of eager dispute and very contradictory assertions among grammarians, lexicographers, orthoepists, and teachers, foreigners as well as natives.

"... De quel usage faudra-t-il rapprocher la règle? Je réponds: de l'usage accepté comme bon à Paris, par le plus grand nombre des gens bien élevés, des honnêtes gens comme on disait au grand siècle..."¹

"... pour connaître le *bon usage*, il faut aller à Paris et y écouter les gens bien élevés, natifs de Paris même et aussi de la province, pourvu que ces provinciaux se soient corrigés de leurs imperfections dialectales. ... Et si nous suivons les conseils des grammairiens anciens et modernes, nous nous y attacherons, faute d'une cour, surtout aux gens de lettres, aux savants, aux grammairiens, aux avocats, aux orateurs ecclésiastiques et aux comédiens."²

"... il est très difficile de définir qui appartient aujourd'hui aux gens bien élevés et

¹ Dupont-Vernon, quoted by Koschwitz, p. xvii.

² *Ibid.* p. xiv.

surtout qui n'y appartient pas. L'opinion générale est qu'il faut resserrer le cercle des autorités de langue. Mais même en nous bornant aux groupes que nous venons d'énumérer, il n'en est pas un seul dont l'autorité ne soit contestée. *Personne ne croit plus aux lexicographes et aux grammairiens. Les orthoépistes et les grammairiens se contredisent et se reprochent mutuellement leurs erreurs. Quant aux phonéticiens, il ne faut pas penser à les prendre pour guides.* Ils aiment trop le langage familier (!), et cela les égare (!?). De plus, nous l'avons vu, ils ne savent même pas si la prononciation des provinces ne vaut pas celle de Paris (!). . . .³

" . . . ce n'est pas aux phonéticiens de chercher et de définir le bon usage: leur tâche est plutôt de constater et de bien examiner toutes les prononciations existant dans les différentes classes et les différentes régions il est naturel que les phonéticiens préfèrent l'étude de la langue familière à celle du soi-disant bon usage. Ce n'est donc pas leur faute, si, ensuite, il se trouve des étrangers qui prennent leurs observations pour une révélation de la seule prononciation à suivre et adoptent ainsi la prononciation des voyous (!?) parisiens combinée, peut-être, avec le lexique des romanciers naturalistes les plus avancés."⁴

Mr. Koschwitz treats the question: "What is the *bon usage* in pronunciation at present, and where is it to be found?"—in a very lively and highly interesting manner throughout several pages and, sometimes, in an amusingly jocular and derisive tone; he apparently dislikes,—I know not why—a certain class of phonetists, whom he calls *les jeunes phonéticiens*. In the end, he tries to answer this difficult and intricate question, of course, but partially and provisionally, according to his own modest avowal (p. xxvii), by giving us in the book proper (pp. 1-135) the following texts with phonetic transcriptions, representing the pronunciation of the respective authors and actors consulted:

Alphonse Daudet, *La chasse à Tarascon*; Émile Zola, *La cathédrale*; Paul Desjardins, *Pauvre ménage*; Édouard Rod, *Journal intime*; Gaston Paris, *Les parlers français*; Ernest Renan, *Mort de Jésus*; Maurice d'Hulst, *Jeanne d'Arc*; Charles Loyson (P. Hyacinthe), *L'origine du déisme*; François Got, *Le mariage de Figaro* (par Beaumarchais), acte v, scène 3,—*Sganarelle* (par Molière), scène 17; Henri de Bornier, *La fille*

³ *Ibid.* pp. xiv-xv. ⁴ *Ibid.* pp. xii-xiii.

de Roland, acte i, scène 2; Silvain et Madame Bartet, *Grisélidis* (par Sylvestre et Morand), acte i, scène 10—acte ii, scène 3; François Coppée, *Pour ne pas vieillir*; Sully-Prudhomme, *Le lever du soleil*; Leconte de Lisle, *La véranda*.

Among Mr. Koschwitz's fifteen authorities, there are five Parisians by birth: Zola, Desjardins, d'Hulst, Coppée, and Sully-Prudhomme. The others, save Silvain and Madame Bartet, about whom no information is given in the notes, were not born in the capital; they are Parisians by adoption and domicile, excepting Rod, native of Nyon, Switzerland, who lives at Geneva. Two of them, Gaston Paris (Avenay, Marne) and François Got (Lignerolles, Orne), may, from a phonetic point of view, undoubtedly, be classed among the 'pure' Parisians even by the most fastidious critic, since they have resided at Paris from childhood or early youth. On the other hand, Zola, the son of an Italian, brought up at Aix-en-Provence, although born at Paris, cannot be considered a 'pure' Parisian in the same sense as the preceding; he belongs rather to the numerous class of 'Parisianized' southerners, *méridionaux naturalisés à Paris*, among whom we have to place also Daudet (Nîmes) and Henri de Bornier (Lunel, Hérault). Renan's birthplace is Tréguier, Côtes-du-Nord, in Brittany; Loyson was born at Orléans and educated at Pau, Basses-Pyrénées; and Leconte de Lisle is a native of Saint-Paul, Ile de la Réunion.

Mr. Koschwitz heard Monsieur Silvain and Madame Bartet recite the passages representing the pronunciation, respectively, of these artists—a dialogue and a monologue in verse—while they were playing the principal parts of Sylvestre and Morand's 'Mystère' on the stage of the Comédie-Française. The famous actor Got, in a private interview, was so kind as to recite for him, from memory, Beaumarchais' prose and Molière's verses. All the other names in Koschwitz's little book represent authors, poets, novelists, journalists, scholars, and pulpit-orators; they also favored him with a special *séance*, and read to him aloud their own works, prose and poetry, always using a text (cf. the notes), purposely speaking for the most part with deliberation and distinctness, allowing the listener plenty

of time to take or complete his notes, while doing their best to convince the foreign phonetist and highly esteemed or warmly recommended philologist that their pronunciation agrees exactly with the *bon usage*.

"Tous ces messieurs m'ont accueilli avec bienveillance et se sont exécutés avec la meilleure grâce du monde en me lisant, récitant ou déclamant des pièces de leur composition et choisies par eux ou proposées par moi-même. En les écoutant, j'ai inscrit sur mes *textes préparés d'avance les particularités* que j'ai pu saisir dans leur prononciation; des échanges d'idées sur des détails de prononciation et sur la meilleure manière de lire ou de déclamer des vers accompagnaient la lecture. Il va sans dire que, si l'occasion se présentait, j'ai observé mes 'sujets' quand ils parlaient en public, ignorant la présence d'un espion de leur prononciation. . . . M. G. Paris qui comme M. Daudet me lisait un texte transcrit déjà par M. P. Passy, a bien voulu lire l'épreuve de son texte de sorte que, pour sa part, on a la *prononciation telle qu'il voulait (?) l'avoir ou qu'elle lui paraît (?) recommandable* et telle que je l'ai entendue. . . . 5

M. G. Paris, après avoir vu ma figuration de son discours, m'a proposé un si grand nombre de corrections intéressantes qu'il m'a paru avantageux de les réunir en groupes et d'y joindre quelques réflexions qui expliqueront comment nous avons pu arriver fréquemment à des notations différentes des mêmes mots et probablement aussi des mêmes sons. . . . Quelquefois, il y a eu certainement erreur de ma part. *Au lieu de préparer d'avance une notation figurée* du discours de M. G. Paris, composée selon les règles de l'orthoépique et individualisée à l'aide des observations faites antérieurement sur la prononciation de mon 'sujet,' pour la corriger pendant l'audition, je m'étais contenté, cette fois, de prendre en main la transcription de M. Passy et d'y introduire les divergences de prononciation que je pouvais saisir. Mal m'en a pris. La figuration de M. Passy répond si peu à la prononciation d'un lecteur soigneux. . . . Ou M. G. Paris, en relisant notre passage, l'a prononcé un peu autrement que dans la lecture qu'il m'en avait faite l'an précédent, ou il a perçu quelquefois les mêmes sons autrement que moi. . . . Quand on se lit à soi-même, pour se rendre compte de sa propre prononciation, on s'observe involontairement, et involontairement aussi on se rappelle et on se règle sur les théories orthoépiques ou grammaticales que l'on connaît et qu'on approuve. . . . il ne se peut pas que M. G. Paris n'ait pas un idéal de la bonne prononciation, qu'il réalise quand il a le temps de réfléchir, mais qu'il n'atteint pas toujours dans les

5 Introduction, pp. xxvii-xxviii.

moments d'irréflexion. . . . M. G. Paris doit avoir fait, en me lisant à haute voix, une petite pause après les mots cités [où il demande des liaisons], soit pour me donner le temps de le suivre avec ma plume, soit pour une autre raison. . . . Il est impossible de ne pas se tromper quelquefois quand on transcrit d'après une seule lecture, et même après une lecture répétée deux fois. . . . 16

I cannot help remarking that the title of Mr. Koschwitz's book '*Les parlers parisiens* . . . , anthologie phonétique' is somewhat illusive and misleading. I, at least, understand and I believe one generally understands by *parlers parisiens* either the various dialects (not pronunciation alone!) spoken by different classes and groups of the Parisian population or (restricting the words to a particular meaning, rather forcibly, I think) the various modes of pronunciation used by one class or group of native or thoroughly naturalized Parisians; or by a certain number of individuals who belong to the same class or group on different occasions, for instance, in daily intercourse, in conversation with friends and relatives or with strangers, in a public speech, in lecturing, in instruction, and also (but by no means exclusively) in reciting something already prepared and committed to memory, and in reading aloud a written or printed text. The anthology, however, contains only specimens of the last two named kinds of the artificial standard pronunciation prevalent among nearly the same class of speakers, literary men and dramatic artists of distinction and reputation, Parisians in regard to language by birth, education, domicile, social communication, and imitation. It excludes and disregards entirely the other forms of their pronunciation, less artificial, more natural, nearer to popular speech, freer, easier, not restrained by the fetters of sight and memory, and not checked by a close observation of rules and a conscious pursuit of linguistic ideals.

Such a proceeding, on the author's part, is clearly opposed to what he seems to promise by the principal title of his book, and not quite in accordance with his orthoepic aims and views set forth in the introduction. But leaving out of consideration a certain number of evident or probable mistakes, some caused by

6 Appendice, pp. 139, 140, 143, 145.

Mr. Koschwitz's peculiar method of transcribing, others, perhaps, unavoidable and inherent in any mode of transcription, and a few eccentric and objectionable features of his system of phonetic characters (for instance, *u*, *i*, *ü* with diacritical marks=*ou ouvert*, *i ouvert*, *u ouvert*; *ouvert* in French!), I think the phonetic texts of the anthology represent pretty fairly and correctly:

I.—*The artificial pronunciation of good Parisian actors* [it does not matter whether they are Parisians by birth or not].

1. An excellent actor of the old generation, a veteran in his art, a staunch upholder of the old tradition of the *Conservatoire* and the *Comédie-Française*.

2. Two actors of the same stage, but belonging to the younger generation, and inclined to give way sometimes to the innovations and liberties of modern and popular, every-day speech, often pointed out as 'vulgar' and, therefore, blamed theoretically, but generally received in practice by the 'good society' of the present day.

II.—*The artificial pronunciation of prominent literary men reading their own works aloud, necessarily rendered more artificial by particular circumstances described above and recounted by Mr. Koschwitz himself.*⁷

During my frequent sojourns at Paris for the purpose of phonetic and orthoepic researches, I several times heard M. Got, M. Silvain and Mme Bartet recite on the stage; M. Loyson preach at his church; M. G. Paris and the late M. Renan lecture at the Collège de France, and I had the good fortune to collect for my own use a good many notes concerning the pronunciation of these *sujets* of Mr. Koschwitz's observation. An exact and careful comparison of his phonetic observations and mine, regarding the same individuals, would pass the proper bounds of an unpretentious critical account of the book before us. Besides, the reader may be assured I should not have anything important to add about the three actors. But I wish, and feel obliged, to

⁷ Also in this case, it is of little importance whether the authorities are natives of Paris or not, if we except a few provincial and individual peculiarities.

make a short remark about at least one of the scholars whose pronunciation is noted, M. G. Paris, whom I also heard speak very often in ordinary conversation as well as in free and informal instruction, both with and without written and printed texts. The pronunciation of this great scholar, no less distinguished by his profound erudition than by his courteous and elegant manner, so far as I know it, in conversation, giving instruction, lecturing, and even in reading notes and passages aloud during his lessons and lectures (*unconscious of being observed, and inattentive to orthoepic rules and prejudices*)—his pronunciation, I repeat, is very much like the 'natural' utterance of every well-bred Parisian on similar occasions. For example: comparatively rare liaisons; frequent assimilation from word to word, from syllable to syllable; frequent omission of *l*, especially after *i*, before a consonant and, particularly, before several consonants, *i plœ:r=il pleure*; frequently, *e*, beside *ë*, instead of *ε*, *me=mes*, *te=tes*, *se=sés*, *le=les*, *se=ces*, *me:zō=maison*, *desā:dr=descendre*, *egzakt=exact*, etc.

This representation very probably agrees, in many essential points of phonetics, also with the manner in which M. G. Paris delivered his speech on *Les parlers français* in the *Congrès des Sociétés Savantes* on May 26th, 1888. But there is no doubt, and it is not surprising at all, that it differs in a great measure from the pronunciation which, according to Mr. Koschwitz's transcriptions, Mr. Paris' corrections, and their mutual discussions (cf. notes and appendix, and see above), the orator used when he read from the text the same speech, on two different occasions, three or four years later; in the first place, observed and listened to by the German phonetist, and then, alone, observing and examining himself, and trying to make his pronunciation as 'natural,' as 'true,' and as perfect as possible by criticising himself and the phonetic representation. The result of such a procedure and so extraordinary conditions through which, and under which, the work of transcription was accomplished,—the result of so much intellectual exertion, meditation, discussion and exchange of opinion, could not be anything but a highly artificial pronunciation that, as the author

says, *se rapproche de la prononciation idéale, recommandée par les orthoépistes.*

For what class of students and teachers has Professor Koschwitz written his book? I suppose he wrote it principally for such as learn and know phonetics. As for the teachers who know phonetics, I am sure most of them are members of the "Association phonétique des professeurs de langues vivantes."

"Mais quand même le phonétiste a bien entendu, comment doit-il figurer les sons entendus? Il y a presque autant de systèmes de transcriptions phonétiques(?) que de phonétistes; ces systèmes doivent leur existence ou à des principes ou à des besoins différents, souvent seulement à la vanité puérile de leurs inventeurs."⁸

Why did Mr. Koschwitz not use for his transcription the international phonetic alphabet, agreed upon, adopted, and recognized as comparatively best for the purposes of instruction, by the members of the "Association phonétique des professeurs de langues vivantes," and tested practically for several years in the issues of the organ of this association, *Le Maître Phonétique*, and other publications?

I repeat and conclude: The 'Anthologie Phonétique' is a notable and important book, particularly on account of its introduction, notes, and appendix; it is, in reality, rather an orthoepical anthology and, as such, of great value for foreigners who like to study the artificial pronunciation of actors and literary men in reciting and reading aloud.

A. RAMBEAU.

Johns Hopkins University.

FRENCH WRITERS.

The Contemporary French Writers. Selections from the French writers of the second part of the nineteenth century. With literary notices, and historical, geographical, etymological, grammatical and explanatory notes. By Mademoiselle ROSINE MELLÉ. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1894. 8vo, pp. xvi, 212.

THE somewhat extended title of this volume in no way misrepresents the nature of its contents. We have seen so many studies and

⁸ Introduction, p. xxv.

excerpts of "Contemporary French Writers," which, when examined, stuck fast at the fateful year of 1848, or at their best could not survive the downfall of the Third Empire, that we had begun to doubt very seriously whether there were any actual contemporary French writers at all—at least in the eyes of the makers of text-books. But here we have the genuine article; we finally touch the promised land; its inhabitants rush to meet us; they are in truth alive, moving, talking, gesticulating, contemporary in fact—that is to say, most of them are contemporary. Taine, Renan, Flaubert, Feuillet seem a trifle deceased, passé, uncontemporary, to be absolutely frank; Jules de Goncourt survives in his inseparable brother, and it was not nature's fault that Guy de Maupassant failed to endure as a contemporary.

All of which does not intend to hint that the title of the book is not exact, for the explanatory title itself makes the allowed reservation in favor of the second part of the nineteenth century, and you cannot put your finger on any author in the list,—unless it be the precocious young Dumas—who got the ear of the public before the year of grace 1850. And to think that of these twenty-five contemporaries whom Mademoiselle Mellé has introduced to us, all but six still walk the Boulevard des Italiens and are welcoming the new order of life which the bankruptcy of Bignon has italicized! Such a correspondence between fact and theory has, perhaps, never before been met with in the annals of Modern Language Series.

And herein lies the value of the selections before us; they do represent current notions and style among the more prominent literary purveyors of France. Even Gyp's satires on the rising generation, and Barrès' reproduction of Symbolist idiocy are given their rightful place in the volume. When Zola is quoted, it is 'la Débâcle' which supplies the lines; 'Rose et Noir' with Ohnet, 'Pâques fleuries' with Theuriet.

Of course, plenty of fault can be found with the character of the selections; no two people ever did agree in taste—or if two, no three, as witness the rule of Jesuit companionship. For instance, I admit that the shooting of

Weiss in 'la Débâcle' is an excellent illustration of Zola's style and power, but I can't read it again, it appeals so to my sympathies, and had I made the book that episode would have remained undisturbed by the Boston type-setter. On the other hand, 'Renée Maupérin,' from which both illustrations of the De Goncourt are taken, is my favorite among their novels. The selection from 'Salammbô' also suits me exactly, though it possibly may not appeal to any other of Flaubert's admirers; in other words, Mademoiselle Mellé has taken what she liked, and some will agree with her here and others there.

Yet there are pages in her book which she may rely on common consciousness to justify. Sarcey's letter on the utility of foreign languages, and the necessity of acquiring them, is one quotation certain of general approval, and Lemaitre's portraits of Renan and Leconte de Lisle are two more; so with her treatment of Richépin and Loti, Renan and de Maupassant. On the contrary, to offer us for Feuillet only an extract of two pages from his 'Dalila,' instead of a longer selection from 'M. de Camors' or 'Julia de Trécoeur,' will, probably, meet with opposition outside of the present review. There are those also who may wish to shorten the sentences of Émile Bergerat in order to lengthen those of Loti or Theuriet; but we are now dealing with matters of inclination, and, perhaps, the only legitimate criticism we can make of the collection begins and ends with Daudet. For that prolific writer is restricted to four pages of the volume, and this modest space is taken up by a description of the Camargue, which Price had already made accessible to classes in his "Choix d'Extraits de Daudet."

Since the importance of the book lies in its texts we have insisted on them to some length, to the detriment of the literary comments and the notes. The Introduction to the selections is an excellent piece of work, dwelling on the ideas and aims of the present race of authors in France, and conveying to the reader a clear notion of the chaotic state of thought and feeling now existing—if a paradox may be pardoned us. In this brief summary, as well as in the more detailed notices of each author cited, Mademoiselle Mellé takes no sides and es-

tablishes no lines of demarkation; so that I, for one, have not the least conception of her attitude towards each or all of her heroes, so sympathetic is she and free from categorical utterances. There is, to be sure, a lurking suspicion in my mind that she enters somewhat into communion with Barrès, but it is only a suspicion. And, perhaps, did she reveal to us her personal views, approve here and condemn there, a great deal of the charm arising from her photographic manner of handling her subject would be lost.

When we come to the notes and the historical facts in the book our utterance is more uncertain. The collection is so obviously suited to those only who have some degree of literary taste as well as great familiarity with French, that any criticisms would be invidious. To appreciate its pages requires a study of style and more or less analysis of thought. So to point out here an incongruity in grammatical statement, and there an omission of chronological testimony, would be rather superfluous; still, from the standpoint of class instruction there are certain deficiencies which might well be remedied. The most important of these would seem to be a little addition to the dates given, so that the works of the authors might be assigned to their proper years; at least it is essential that the selections be identified more systematically. For instance, we can only infer the source of the three extracts from Renan, and my ignorance of Richépin's prose writings leaves me entirely in the dark as to whether the selections from them are taken from the books mentioned in his biography.

The notes are varied in character, considerable attention being paid to etymologies. I should have preferred more literary criticism in them, and less rendering of obvious passages from the original. Considering the grade of student to whom the volume is addressed, explanations of Venice, Ireland and Sicily—under the note for Palermo—are rather unexpected. There ought also to be page references from the notes to the text, to save the time of both instructor and student; the reference by selection is not sufficient. Yet, these are faults of detail and unimportant, considering the character of the book; the

real test lay in the selections themselves, and the historical treatment of their authors. And in these respects Mademoiselle Mellé has well performed her task, and has presented us with a living insight of living men, contemporaries of another race and environment, explained and defended by an appreciative compatriot.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Histoire de la littérature française par ALCÉE

FORTIER, professeur à l'université Tulane de la Louisiane. New York: Henry Holt and Company; F. W. Christern. Boston: Carl Schoenhof, 1893. in-12, pp. v, 351.

CE volume dans lequel Mr. Fortier nous donne un abrégé de la littérature française mérite de notre part un accueil bienveillant. Il nous vient d'un pays où les lettres françaises sont tenues en grand honneur, voire même cultivées avec succès, et où le nom de France rappelle encore de chers et glorieux souvenirs. La Louisiane s'est toujours distinguée par son attachement filial à la mère-patrie et, forcée de s'en séparer politiquement, elle a trouvé dans les institutions, le langage et la littérature de la France un lien que nous aimons à croire indissoluble. Aussi les deux qualités les plus en vue de l'ouvrage de Mr. Fortier, c'est la sympathie la plus sincère et l'admiration la plus franche, reposant l'une et l'autre sur la connaissance profonde qu'il a de notre littérature.

Le but modeste de l'auteur est simplement d'aider à l'étude de la littérature française et d'induire les élèves à en lire les chefs-d'œuvre. Pour leur rendre cette lecture plus facile et plus attrayante, il vise surtout à leur faire connaître et apprécier les principaux écrivains. Voilà pourquoi il appuie sur les détails biographiques, s'efforce de replacer autant que possible l'écrivain dans le milieu où il a vécu, et a recours à l'analyse littéraire des œuvres. Nous pensons avoir remarqué que, dans son histoire de la littérature française, M. Fortier tient surtout à persuader. Le style ne manque ni de chaleur ni d'entrain et la manière de narrer a beaucoup de vivacité et d'intérêt.

S'il y avait un semblant de reproche à lui faire, ce serait que chez lui l'historien se confond un peu trop avec le conférencier. On sent qu'il cherche à se mettre en contact immédiat avec le lecteur, qu'il converse pour ainsi dire avec lui, ce qui, après tout, est une manière assez habile d'amener la conviction. Cette histoire n'étant qu'un abrégé destiné aux élèves ne comporte nécessairement ni les détails étendus ni l'exposition élaborée des vues critiques, mais on peut dire que rien de bien important n'a été oublié; les aperçus sur l'histoire, la société et l'évolution littéraire, développés en tête des différentes parties de l'ouvrage ou disséminés ça et là dans les chapitres, suffisent pour faire saisir aux élèves la nature des événements qui, aux époques les plus marquantes, ont influencé la littérature française dans la production de ses chefs-d'œuvre.

Dans ses premiers chapitres sur le moyen-âge, après quelques remarques indispensables sur l'origine de la langue française, l'auteur traite successivement de l'épopée, du drame, des fabliaux et autres compositions s'y rattachant; de la poésie considérée dans ses différentes branches, allégorique, didactique et lyrique, et enfin des premiers essais de la prose française. Le traitement accordé au moyen-âge pourra, à première vue, paraître insuffisant; mais si l'on a égard au but que se propose l'auteur, on conviendra que les élèves y trouveront tout ce qu'il leur importe de savoir de cette période littéraire. Le seizième siècle n'est pas beaucoup plus favorisé que l'époque précédente, le drame se contentant de cinq ou six pages. Marot, Ronsard, Calvin, Rabelais, Amyot et Montaigne sont les écrivains qui méritent et attirent spécialement notre attention. Faire rire, nous dit-on, tel a surtout été le but de l'œuvre de Rabelais. C'est peut-être ne pas estimer à sa juste valeur l'esprit philosophique du joyeux curé; nous pensons que la bouffonnerie ou la gaîté rabelaisienne servait de passeport indispensable à la satire.—C'est au dix-septième siècle que M. Fortier a donné la place d'honneur, et c'est aussi cette période qui a dû lui fournir le plus d'occasions d'exprimer ses vues personnelles. Dans son appréciation littéraire des auteurs et des œuvres nous n'avons rien remarqué de bien nouveau, rien qui contredît d'une manière

frappante l'opinion générale. Cependant on reconnaît vite que les observations de l'auteur viennent d'un fonds très considérable de lecture, et d'une opinion formée indépendamment de celle des autres; en tout cas, l'accusation de plagiat ne saurait l'atteindre, et c'est là un mérite dont il faut tenir compte.—Parlant de Corneille et de Racine, M. Fortier nous dit que la différence des époques où paraissent ces deux génies explique la grande différence qui existe entre eux. C'est concéder beaucoup à l'influence du *moment* et en tirer des explications que notre devoir est de rechercher également dans l'individualité.—Dans un parallèle entre Bossuet et Fénelon, nous voyons ces deux écrivains proclamés égaux en génie. C'est évidemment faire tort au premier. Le chapitre des femmes auteurs est un des plus intéressants et des mieux composés; cependant on proteste intérieurement et on se demande si ce n'est pas violer légèrement les lois de la proportion que de consacrer à Mesdames de la Fayette, de Sévigné, de Maintenon et de Staël, un bon quart de ce que l'on a à dire sur la littérature française aux dix-septième et dix-neuvième siècles.

De tous les auteurs du dix-huitième siècle, Rousseau semble avoir la préférence de M. Fortier; il y a, peut-être, un peu trop de détails biographiques dont quelques uns manquant d'exactitude rigoureuse. Rousseau ne dit pas avoir jamais témoigné l'intention d'embrasser le catholicisme, d'autres la témoignèrent pour lui.—Les quatre pages consacrées à la poésie nous convainquent aisément de son peu d'importance à cette époque. La comédie occupe une place plus considérable et l'on peut se faire une idée assez complète de son évolution après Molière.

M. Fortier nous avertit lui-même qu'il s'est contenté de nommer les principaux écrivains du dix-neuvième siècle, et d'appeler l'attention sur les ouvrages les plus importants. Le chef-d'œuvre de Flaubert ne peut trouver grâce à ses yeux; il est, dit-il, d'une immoralité profonde. Citons l'opinion de Sainte-Beuve qui, après avoir reproché à Flaubert de ne s'être pas arrêté en deça de certains détails, ajoute: "le livre a une moralité: l'auteur ne l'a pas cherchée, il ne tient qu'au lecteur de la tirer, même terrible."

Pour ce qui a rapport au style et à la composition il ne nous semble pas que M. Fortier ait pris dans son 'Histoire' autant de précautions que dans son livre des 'Sept grands auteurs.' La phrase est parfois chargée d'éléments qui retardent sa marche et produisent, à la lecture, la sensation d'un effort. Il n'a pas su éviter, dans la mesure du possible, la répétition des mêmes sons et des mêmes expressions. Les mots *popularité*, *populaire*, *caractère* sont quelquefois employés où nous préfererions *réputation*, *renommée*, *en faveur*, *fréquenté*, *personnage*. Les verbes subissent quelquefois, dans l'emploi de leurs temps, des changements trop soudains et, ça et là, on a peine à saisir l'enchaînement des détails. Tout le monde, sans doute, conviendra que dans un abrégé d'histoire littéraire, où l'on passe en revue tant de noms, où un si grand nombre d'ouvrages demandent des détails analogues, où, faute d'espace, tout se condense sous la plume de l'écrivain, il est à peu près impossible de ne pas montrer quelques défaillances. Nous pensons que M. Fortier a atteint le but qu'il s'est proposé, et que son livre contribuera à l'étude de la littérature française.

JOS. A. FONTAINE.

Bryn Mawr College.

NEW LIGHT ON THE ROMANTIC MOVEMENT.

The Beginning of the English Romantic Movement. A Study in Eighteenth Century Literature by WILLIAM LYON PHELPS, A.M. (Harvard), Ph.D. (Yale). Instructor in English Literature at Yale College. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893. 12mo, pp. viii, 192.

THE old-fashioned history of literature was rather tame. It ran to metaphors and glittering, elusive generalities; and worst of all, it repeated, without examination, traditional estimates and opinions. It was Mr. Saintsbury who first showed us in his admirable manual on French Literature, what a history of literature might become in the hands of a man with an independent point of view and unflagging industry. He did not venture to pass opinion except on books that he had actually read. As a natural result his history, whether you agree with his conclusions or not,

is unfailingly fresh and stimulating. This principle is the only sound one, and so obvious that to state it seems almost unnecessary. One of its latest applications is in Doctor Phelps's study, and the result is a most readable and interesting book. Not only are fresh facts brought to notice, but they are stated with that convincing firmness of touch which goes with new-found and interesting knowledge. Besides the book is noteworthy as among the first-fruits of the new spirit which is showing itself in the study of English on this continent. The material is investigated not for the sake of grammar or linguistics but literature; the methods of research are rigidly scientific; and the aim is human,—more precise and fruitful knowledge of literature as the expression of a nation's life. At the same time there is a distinct effort in the direction of form. The writings of the new school shall not only discuss literature; they shall also be literature.

Dr. Phelps begins properly, by defining his terms; and naturally finds some difficulty in settling the meaning of "romantic." After passing various definitions in review, he concludes that the three essential qualities of romantic literature are "Subjectivity, Love of the Picturesque, and a Reactionary Spirit." He next discusses the chief characteristics of the Augustan literature; and touches lightly on its distaste for enthusiasm, its distrust of deep feeling, its tendency to exalt the letter above the spirit, its reverence for the classical, its preference of the town to the country, its tendency to satire and its disregard of the older English literature. But strong as Augustan prejudices were, there were signs even at the beginning of the century of reaction against them. Dr. Phelps finds even in Pope low murmurs of the personal note; while, in Croxall, Parnell, Allan Ramsay and Hamilton, there is frequent expressions of deep and genuine passion. Not only is a protest heard here and there against the regnant spirit, there is also protest against the regnant form, the heroic couplet. The protest took various shapes, as blank verse, octosyllabics, the sonnet. But the most significant of all was imitation of Spenser; and the discussion of this aspect of the movement makes one of the

most important chapters in the book. Instead of vague general statements, sliding into metaphors which are neither to hold nor bind, an orderly arrangement of plain facts forms an unbroken chain of evidence. What is true of Spenser is true also of Milton. He is read and imitated by many writers who find their chief inspiration in the vein of melancholy running through 'Il Penseroso.' The Love of the Picturesque in Romanticism turns the eyes of men naturally and irresistibly towards the past. An interest springs up in Gothic architecture, in the age of chivalry, in the national ballads, in the fragments, genuine or fictitious, of ancient poetry. Horace Walpole, Bishop Percy, Macpherson and Gray all play important parts in this portion of the story. Gray, Dr. Phelps argues with great ingenuity, exemplifies in his own career the gradual change in taste from classicism to romanticism. And, finally, the results of the whole discussion are neatly brought together in a short concluding chapter.

Such is the book in outline. I have purposely refrained from mingling expression of opinion with the summary. The plan should stand by itself; the criticism will follow in its proper place. The style is decidedly the man himself in this instance, being vivacious and full of decision. Dr. Phelps has views of his own, he has a right to them, and he does not hesitate to say what he thinks. When, for instance, in his discussion of Gray's sterility, he finds himself unable to agree with Matthew Arnold, he dissents with an emphasis which is quite startling. It is as when the disinherited knight's spear-point smote the Templar's shield at Ashby-de-la-Zouche, till it rang again. There is much to be said on his side. His explanation cannot fail to impress the reader as by far the more reasonable of the two. Again, one seldom comes across quotation put to better use than honest Harry Bailey's famous interruption to Chaucer's tale on page 109. At times, however, this sprightliness carries the writer away. Why be so severe on poor Lloyd (p. 79)? Why call him "rascal"? Would it not be better to emulate that leader of the British House of Commons, who made his follower substitute for "murderous ruffian" (a term bestowed on an opponent

in the heat of debate) the synonym, "excited politician?" Surely, it would be enough to call Lloyd a "Bohemian." Still, vivacity is too rare a failing in books of this kind to seriously quarrel with any of its manifestations. There are a few minor defects, however, which call for correction. Occasionally, one lights upon such doubtful English as, "comparing the relation between Milton, Spenser and Pope" (p. 8); or a careless phrase like "took a lady for a ride on the river" (p. 61); or a mixed metaphor like "the new emphasis laid on all this evidently contained seeds of the Romantic movement" (p. 100). Such blemishes, though, no doubt, due to hasty composition, interfere with the reader's pleasure, and should not re-appear in a second edition.

As already more than hinted, Dr. Phelps holds his opinions strongly and his manner of expressing them is the reverse of shilly-shally. Such a manner is certain to provoke opposition; and it is well that it should. Discussion of some of the issues raised cannot fail to be fruitful. Many, for instance, would wish to see his characterization of Addison modified, and fuller justice done to the great conservative work of the Augustans. But these are minor matters. To my thinking, there is one serious defect in the plan of the book, but one that can be remedied by the addition of a new chapter. Ample space is given to the discussion of Spenser's influence and Milton's, while to the king of romanticists no separate chapter is devoted. Not only that, but this singular statement is made regarding him.

"Shakspeare was commonly regarded as the greatest English writer, although he was handled in a way that would nowadays be thought sacrilegious; and even though admired, he was not very widely read and by no means always understood" (p. 15).

All the facts point the other way. So far from being neglected or unappreciated by the Augustans, it is precisely with the rise of Augustan taste that an intelligent interest is taken in Shakspeare. The seventeenth century had merely reprinted the first folio, errors and all, three times, and, after the Restoration, travestied the great dramatist or put him aside for Dryden or Davenant. But as soon as the classic spirit had definitely asserted itself,

Shakspeare was edited in something like modern fashion. As early as 1709 Rowe's monumental work was ready for the press. He had been at pains to establish a text and to gather together the scanty facts of Shakspeare's life. It must not be forgotten that to Rowe, Betterton, Aubrey and Davenant we owe nearly everything that is known of the great dramatist's personal history. A second edition of Rowe was required by 1714, and nine years later we find the acknowledged chief of the Augustans, Pope himself putting his name to a new and magnificent edition. He did his task very ill; and his errors were pointed out by an editor of genius whom we are only learning to value. Theobald's exposure of Pope's deficiencies, Pope's pillorying of Theobald in the 'Dunciad' are significant facts. It is still more significant that though Pope made him a laughing-stock and had all the wits and all the town on his side, Theobald's first edition put down his clever rival's, and sold over twelve thousand copies. Both issued second editions, but Theobald's remained the favorite, and is to this day the basis of all sound editing. It held its ground even against Hanmer's (1744) and Warburton's (1747) and was a third time reprinted in 1757. In all, there are *eight* distinct editions of Shakspeare in the first half of the eighteenth century, as against *two* of Spenser. Dr. Phelps must have for the moment lost sight of these well-known facts when he wrote Shakspeare "was not very widely read." Further, Dr. Phelps's book itself contains evidence as to the influence of Shakspeare upon the romanticists. There are various complimentary references to his genius in quotations used for other purposes; see pp. 90, 91, and notes, p. 85. Of Upton's imitation of Spenser, Dr. Phelps says, "many phrases are taken almost bodily from Shakspeare," and quotes in illustration (p. 72, note).

"And ever and anon the sheeted Dead
Did squeak and gibber thro' the myrksome Air."

See also, pp. 16, 17. Not only that Shakspeare was read, but that he was admired and imitated by the early romanticists is plain from Dr. Phelps's unconscious statements. That he was a much more potent force in bringing

on this movement will appear, I feel certain, from a second examination of the literature. And the diligence which has produced the admirable chapter on Spenser can easily supply the missing one on the greatest of the Elizabethans. The treatise will gain thereby in depth and completeness.

In spite of what I cannot but consider an oversight, Dr. Phelps has obtained most important results. In no previous work has the origin of the Romantic movement been traced so carefully; nowhere else has the story of its rise been set down so fully and in such plain terms. He has also made clear what was only previously suspected,—the supreme influence of the Elizabethans both in matter and form, and the early rise of Romantic tendencies. The long array of imitators of Spenser is surprising and convincing; and the connection between the followers of Milton and the "grave-yard" school is fully established. But the method used is even more commendable than the results obtained. For hearsay, we have fact; and for showy hypothesis, painstaking research. The power of such a method to help us to knowledge in this particular field is only dawning upon us. Dr. Phelps's use of it has given us a book which every student of the romantic movement will find indispensable.

ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN.

Dalhousie College.

FRENCH DRAMA.

Louis XI, tragédie par CASIMIR DELAVIGNE, edited with introduction and notes by H. W. EVE, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Head Master of University College School, London. Pitt Press Series. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1894.

THE life of Louis XI appeals to English speaking people for several reasons: he has been a favorite character with some of the modern English tragic actors,—notably, Mr. Irving; his portrayal by Scott in 'Quentin Durward' has made him known to a larger circle. In his early years he viewed that great struggle which ended in the overthrow of the English power in France in 1453; his reign also represents one of the most critical periods of French

history—a period during which the feudal power in France was broken, and the feudal nobility made subservient to the royal power. It was a time of consolidation, reconstruction, and of reform, and one full of dramatic action.

Delavigne's drama is highly interesting to the student of literary history; it shows how he regarded the crusade begun by Victor Hugo in his preface to *Cromwell* in 1827. 'Louis XI' was represented for the first time in 1832, but the author had conceived the plan nine years earlier. In his early works Delavigne was a follower of the classic style; in his later works, he was somewhat influenced by Romanticism, but never sympathized with it in all respects; in 'Louis XI' he adheres to the old versification, but does not feel bound by the unities of time and place; in short, he is neither a follower of the old style nor of the new, but chooses what he considers best from both, hence the work is important in the history of the transition.

This edition is preceded by an introduction on the life and works of Delavigne and an account of his relation to the literary history of his time. It is a matter of regret that such a literary introduction is not considered a requisite in all annotated editions of foreign classics; no student can study a work intelligently who does not know its relation to literary history. The introduction also contains an account of the life of Louis XI, of the state of France at his accession, of his triumph over the feudal nobility, together with some remarks on the other characters of the play. Twelve pages of the introduction are devoted to an explanation of French versification; the text is followed by seventy-eight pages of notes. Those of an historical and explanatory nature are very valuable for a college edition, but many of the grammatical notes might have been omitted, since students would already have encountered the difficulties here treated, in earlier reading, before being introduced to such a work as this. In a few cases the editor has ventured upon derivations, but, in this field, his statements are, in some instances, not the etymologies at present accepted; among these are *donc* which is derived from *tunc, oui* from *hoc illud*, *néant* from *ne ens*. The explanation of the *v* in such words as

glaiue (l. 2067) *veuve, juive* is not the accepted one.

One admirable feature of the editions of this series is the care shown in reading the proofs. Not a single printer's mistake has been noted.

THOMAS LOGIE.

Rutgers College.

GUY DE MAUPASSANT.

L'Œuvre De Guy de Maupassant, par RENÉ DOUMIC,—*Revue Des Deux Mondes* 1^{er} Novembre, Paris, 1893, pp. 187-209.

Les Nouvelles de M. De Maupassant, par BRUNETIÈRE,—*Revue Des Deux mondes*, 1889. Vol. lxxxix, 1888, pp. 693-704.

Les Contemporains. Études et Portraits Littéraires (première série), par JULES LEMAITRE. 1890, pp. 285-310. *Guy De Maupassant*.

TAKING M. Doumic's article as the basis of this review, I purpose to arrange his material under the three heads, the man, his times and his writings. Of these, however, we are to deal especially with the latter in this paper; yet it must be remembered that every poem, novel, system of philosophy, or history, is but the exponent of the man and his times, hence, in the treatment of the one, we necessarily have a fusion of the three.

I. THE MAN.

Especially worthy of note in this connection is the marked individuality of de Maupassant and the influence of the same upon the productions under consideration. Foremost in this catalogue of personal traits, are to be mentioned his invincible will, his incessant labor, his tireless and ceaseless activity of mind. This predisposition to patient and careful study, springing from an exhaustless wealth of energy, naturally conducted him to the high and exalted literary ideal: that the professional writer should be a real artist in literature; that he should study his profession as the sculptor, painter and architect do theirs; that literary science is an art, having powers of expression, fine shades of discrimination, rules and laws of which the application requires untiring effort. He spurned the idea of

writing without the most careful preparation; he protested vigorously against unconscious productions—that a man could, unconsciously, under the inspiration of thought, turn off a completed volume without any further reworking. On the contrary, that for which de Maupassant strove most, was a conscious product, a systematized literature, the result of professional training.

In consequence of the early bent of his nature and his habits of study he lived a solitary and secluded life. Shutting himself out from the world and friends, his sad nature converted every consolation into a sorrow, after the manner of the famous weed whose horrible taste is said to embitter the whole system when once imbibed. Like John Milton, the great English poet, he dwelt apart, the world knowing little of his life; but, after all, the melancholy loneliness of the man lends a peculiar dignity to his character; surrounding him with the silence and solitude of his closet, we are wont to read into his life the intellectual elements of a man selected from some lofty and stirring epoch of history. In addition to his indomitable will, high ideal, intense application, pessimism and solitary disposition, we must note his decided modesty: he wrote not for fame and notoriety, but as a simple business of bread-making.

II. HIS TIMES.

The next influence to be considered in the order of our author's mental make-up is that of the individuality of his age; as a matter of fact, the influence of the man upon his times and of the times upon the man, is the real basis of literature. In the light of historic setting, the writer can be located and his productions interpreted.

The chief literary tendencies bearing directly upon the subject in hand, were the two kinds of novel, subjective and objective romance. The partisans of subjective romance demand that the writer shall strive to indicate the slightest evolutions of the soul, and all the most secret motives which determine our action, allowing only a secondary importance to the resulting fact. According to this school, it is necessary to write a novel after the manner of a philosopher who composes a

work on psychology, tracing the whys and resolves to their most distant sources, and clearly discerning all the struggles of a soul that acts under the impulse of passion, interest or instinct.

The partisans of objectivity, on the contrary, profess to give us an exact representation of what takes place in life. They carefully avoid all complicated explanations and all dissertations on motives, and limit themselves to placing before our eyes personages and events; instead of explaining at length the state of mind, authors of the objective school seek to portray the action or gesture to which this state of mind would inevitably lead under given conditions; they conduct their hero in such a manner from one end of the volume to the other, that his every act and movement can but reflect his inmost nature, his thoughts, his resolves and his doubts. Thus they hide their psychology, making it the simple framework of the book, as the invisible skeleton is the frame of the human body.

To this school of objective romance, with its novel of character, belonged Guy de Maupassant, one of the keenest and closest observers of men and things. He possessed in a pre-eminent degree these two simple faculties: an exact vision of form and an instinctive intuition of its underlying parts; he defined as the special faculty of the writer, the eye, which absorbed all things—life appealed to him only through the senses.

As there is always a close and vital connection between religion and thought, between morals and literature, we are already prepared to forecast the ethical tendencies of the above-mentioned literary schools. In circumstances so diverse and unhealthy, it is not strange that the worst men become the best and the best become the worst. Dante tells us of a wondrous encounter between a man and a serpent; after cruel blows had been inflicted, each was transformed into the likeness of its antagonist; the serpent's tail divided into two legs; the man's legs intertwined themselves into a tail. At length the serpent stood up a man and the man fell down a serpent licking the dust and hissing away. Something like this was the moral transformation that took place in the time of de Maupassant between the better and

the worse nature of man; as a natural deduction from this realism and materialism, we have more or less scepticism and, hence, a doubting, fatalistic, pessimistic de Maupassant is a legal product.

III. WRITINGS.

Born and reared in Normandy, it is but natural that de Maupassant should draw a goodly part of his material from this section of France. Here he found most of the landscapes and personages, thorough-fares and market-places, taverns and tribunals set forth in his story and fiction. His studies being ended, he was employed for a time in a Government department, where, by reason of his close contact with boulevard journals, he collected his material for the types of men and women found in 'Bel Ami.'

A good half of his short stories belong to a class which is called Gallic. Reviving that most ancient form of French literature, the *conte* of La Fontaine and Voltaire, de Maupassant was in heart and in the largest sense of the word, a Gaul; he added to the genial mirth of his forefathers the pessimism of the present.

The plots of his novels are for the most part borrowed from friends; and a like criticism may be justly passed on his dramas. 'Musotte' resembles too much the style and spirit of Jacques Normand and 'Paix du Ménage' reminds us too strongly of Alexandre Dumas.

As many other great writers of his time, de Maupassant began his literary career by writing poetry. Though possessed of some merit, his efforts in this direction were little more than signal failures, showing few of the requisites commonly ascribed to the so-called born poet. According to a universal and firmly grounded article of literary faith, an age of science and materialism is rarely productive of great poets. Thus it is not strange that the realism of de Maupassant rendered him incapable of fostering the highest gifts of the poet—the sweetness of melody, the richness of harmony, the sublimity of imagination. Possessing none of these beyond the ordinary, his significance as a writer rested almost solely upon his powers of observation, narration and description. The bulk of his poetry is found in

the two collections, 'Au bord de l'eau' and 'Venus Rustique.'

Even as a novelist de Maupassant was not at his best; the frame of romance was too vast for him; he never wished to make long campaigns with his characters, preferring rather to write many books than to carry one to a great length; yet in spite of this difficulty, it must be added that his novels take high rank in the rôle of fiction. His primary object was to describe character, as differing from the novel of incident whose chief object is to portray environment; the latter would graphically picture surroundings and leave the reader to judge the character from these; it would describe minutely the many and varied features of environment, and leave one to infer what kind of a personality could live therein. The character novelist delights in a clean, clear-cut analysis of character, a bold delineation of men and women as they appear in real life.

Like Victor Hugo, de Maupassant thought the individual always innocent, and society or some higher power responsible for every crime, or injustice. As in the case of *Jean Valjean*, his heroes invariably find themselves victims of circumstances which they can not avoid. In 'Petite Roque' de Maupassant studies the problem as to how an honest man in an hour of aberration, can become the equal of the worst criminal. *Yvette* is a girl doomed because of her low origin to be just what her mother was, notwithstanding her longings, thirstings and yearnings to rise to a higher plain. By a strange process of destiny, M. Parent, a good and credulous bourgeois, is forced to the recognition of the fact that his wife's chastity has been robbed by his friend. 'Le Horla' is filled with terrifying confessions, and the most heart-rending sadness is allotted to men. 'Bel Ami' is a species of libertinism worthy of Don Juan; 'Boule de Suif' reads like a corrupting and contaminating story of some oriental harem; 'L'Inutile Beauté' is the jealousy of a man leading to the important truth that woman is to serve a higher end in this world than the mere re-peopling of society. Thus from almost every page glints forth a sickly distrust in all human things; de Maupassant believes religion a farce, and law a propagator of crimes. He believes science,

art and poetry decided failures, and thinks society itself, contrary to the beautiful idealism of the poet Shelly, but a return to barbarism. He has painted no characters of superior culture, holding that thought, the only difference between man and the lower animals, is man's greatest curse.

The novels mentioned thus far belong to the school of naturalism. 'Pierre et Jean,' 'Fort comme la Mort' and 'Notre Cœur,' on the other hand, are largely subjective. The growing jealousy of the two brothers, the restless walks and sleepless nights of *Pierre*, the sad discovery of the mother's sin, and the final flight of the disheartened son, is a problem of psychology from beginning to end. Equally as metaphysical is the wild despair of disappointed love in the bosom of *Bertin* and the suitor of Mademoiselle *De Brune*, the heroes of the second and third works above mentioned.

Though gifted beyond many of his fellows as a poet and novelist, it was in his rich and fascinating novelet that de Maupassant really won his literary spurs. It was certainly here that he displayed to greatest advantage his judgment, taste and originality. The French short story in its present popular form dates from him. During the last ten years of his life he contributed an almost weekly *nouvelle* to some Parisian publication. He published more than a hundred tales that were infinitely relished by the reading public of France and the world. "L'Histoire d'une fille de ferme," "l'Héritage," "Mon oncle," "Jules," "les Bijoux," "l'Enfant" and "Ce cochon de Morin" give an impression of completeness and perfection: we perceive at once the naturalness, harmony and equilibrium of the whole, nothing lacking, nothing in excess. The influence of the *conte* on the modern story constitutes no inconsiderable movement in literature; to its revival we owe the good as well as the mass of mediocre and insipid stories that flood our country to-day. The *nouvelle* has become a current production, having its place in the journal, the imaginative chronicle and the article of information.

De Maupassant's most distinctive feature, that which differentiates him from most of the writers of his time, is his marked impersonali-

ty. In his books he never puts himself on the stage, neither by the expression of a judgment nor the display of a taste or a preference. He has exercised jealous care in concealing from us that which is eventful in the life of the heart and spirit; he never reveals his life to the reader, claiming that a writer should only give to the public his work and not its sources. However, like the author of *Hamlet*, he does reveal himself indirectly in everything that he wrote.

This argument of M. Doumic as to the impersonality of de Maupassant is itself liable to criticism. The first and most serious objection to it is, that de Maupassant does speak of himself directly. For more than thirty pages of his introduction to '*Pierre et Jean*' the author gives, in a most conclusive manner, his attitude toward the French novel. He lays down his opinions in unequivocal terms. In the second place, impersonality in the sense in which M. Doumic uses the word, belongs to almost every novelist and is not, therefore, a distinguishing characteristic of de Maupassant; in other words, every real romance writer is forced, from the nature of the novel itself, to speak of his characters rather than of himself, revealing himself through his characters.

M. Doumic posits the proposition that de Maupassant had neither invention nor imagination; the reader has well divined that the material handed him always remained a constant quantity. As an explanation of this fact, the critic cites the two schools of French fiction: The one proceeded upon the fact that the idea itself is the generator of the work; that it calls forth, modifies and vivifies objective facts; that the writer rules and dominates the impression received from reality. The other school holds the orthodox principle of naturalism that the facts of external nature govern the writer; that he operates solely upon the data coming from without; that it is an unpardonable literary heresy to add to or detract therefrom a single iota. Hence, no room is left for imagination or invention; to track nature, as the rattle snake follows its pilot, is the only legitimate procedure. To the latter school belongs de Maupassant.

This logic may be questioned in part. As far as de Maupassant's novels are purely realistic, I grant the truth of what has been said; but his psychological novels, already mentioned, bear unmistakable evidence of imagination. As to his power of invention, M. Doumic himself states that he was a creator in the short story, hence, our author must have had to a certain extent, at least, both invention and imagination.

In his ever present, Byronic inveighing against the bitter fate of man, de Maupassant but shared the too common sorrow of literary men. Like sad Harold, Faust and the Prince of Abasynia he eliminated from life every object of hope and every spur to energy and activity; his melancholy was in some respects similar to the unending complaint of the Greek poets against the cruelties of destiny; he was ever Prometheus chained to the horrid rock of fate or Mazeppa linked to the wild horse of passion. He proclaimed everywhere the doctrine of vanity, and protested lively against anything like Emersonian optimism; he believed God ignorant of his creatures and his countless worlds created. The idea of death haunts him perpetually; over this certain annihilation he broods, dreams and grows miserable. Equally mournful and lugubrious is his conception of love; he admits that Platonic affection is a beautiful dream of humanity, the dream of a union of souls in love, forgetful of self, a mysterious union above the contemptible and disgusting things of this world, but doubting the practicability of such a thing, he goes at once to the other extreme, to love merely for the gratification of carnal and sensual desires. Then he says, from the nature of the case, there is but a short period in which one is capable of loving and being loved, and following this brief period is a season of grief, which he calls death, the death of love and hope; from the memory of other days nothing remains save the regret of things gone, and over the saddening years to come there rises but one image, the image of death. His constant thought seems to have been centered in the doleful philosophy that we can neither know, do, nor imagine anything for the reason that we are imprisoned. Nevertheless, there is at least one redeeming feature

in the sad lament of this melancholy man: his was a pessimism generous, efficacious and salutary, born not of hatred, but of sympathy; his was a sadness inspiring progress and giving here and there a faint glimpse of the grandeur of human destiny. Like the unfortunate man doomed to hear the weird story of the Ancient Mariner, we may turn from this narrative of gloom sadder but wiser men.

In reviewing the article of M. Brunetière and that by M. Lemaitre, it is sufficient simply to dwell for a moment on the facts additional to or differing from, those embodied in the criticism of M. Doumic on de Maupassant. M. Brunetière's differentiation of de Maupassant from Zola, Flaubert and Daudet is the point of chief interest in the first article and merits special mention. In the first place, the realism of de Maupassant is widely different from that of Zola and Daudet; Daudet merely ascribes to his characters a mania or a bad habit, attaching to them some such epithet as "la nommée Delobelle"; Zola heaps up details, giving every aspect of profile and full view; his is largely the work of generalization rather than seizing of the essential traits that stamp each portrait with a distinct personality. His delineations are of great types, depicting as a rule the features which belong to many in common and to no one in particular. He frequently portrays a whole province in a single character. On the contrary, de Maupassant observes closely his model, laying stress upon those points which distinguish and individualize his characters; his descriptions are of actual life and belong to but one personage; there is no mistake about *Bertin*, *Boule de Suif*, *Parent* and *Pierre*; they are separate and distinct beings. Of the three authors just mentioned, he is by far the most real and natural.

A second point of difference is de Maupassant's impersonality as contrasted with the personality of the other two, but as this fact has already been discussed it needs but a passing notice here.

Between the pessimism of de Maupassant and that of Zola and Flaubert, a sharp distinction should be drawn; the melancholy of the first was due in the main to a lack of faith in the capabilities of men; he thought every

effort of humanity useless and vain, but was deeply sympathetic. This sadness proceeded from a denial of justice and not a hatred. Flaubert and Zola, on the other hand, were misanthropes. Like Byron they looked with proud disdain upon the tenderest and truest affections of the human heart; they resemble that noxious Sardinian soil of which the intense bitterness is said to have been perceptible even in its honey; theirs is the fruitless bitterness of a misanthrope—the melancholy sadness of de Maupassant was the despair of a faithless but sympathetic soul.

M. Jules Lemaitre treats only the *conte*, giving in brief its historical development from its origin to de Maupassant. It has assumed in turn the form of the Gallic fable, the gay, religious and marvellous romance of the Middle Ages, the sensual and corrupt adventure of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, culminating in the popular newspaper story of modern times.

A point of importance to note, is the contrast or comparison of La Fontaine and de Maupassant, representatives of two extreme and widely separated periods of the *conte*. The former had but seven or eight personages, always the same; to know these seven or eight faces, is to be fairly acquainted with all that he wrote. The latter was a realist in the strictest sense of the word and painted no two characters alike; to him every being was different from all others. The former was an optimist, ever moving to sweet and genial laughter the good Gallic fathers who were easily touched by the richness of his mirth and humor; the latter was a pessimist dubbed at different times and under varying circumstances as sensualist, brutalist and sceptic. In consequence of his realism, de Maupassant saw life just as it is, with the sad and the joyous mixed like the arrows of Death and Cupid in the cave.

In conclusion, M. Lemaitre dwells at some length on the classic diction of de Maupassant, that most splendid polish of his composition. This classic quality or form of his writings is seen in the excellence, neatness, exactness and unsought flow of his words; it is also seen in the naturalness of his prose, in the good and high standard of his vocabulary and in

the simplicity and rhythm of his phrases. More than almost any other writer of his time, de Maupassant has approached the clearness, beauty and perfection of classic composition.

Thus far the three articles whose titles head this paper, together with some strictures on M. Doumic's view as to de Maupassant's lack of invention, and his impersonality, have occupied our attention. I now pass to a brief discussion of the author's low estimation of women, his treatment of friendship, the plan of his novel and the classification of his short story as gathered from a personal examination of his writings.

Decidedly one of the most objectionable and blamable features of de Maupassant's novels is his low estimate of woman's character; his women, as a rule, have neither virtue, refinement nor honor; chastity in woman is treated as insignificant. The mother of *Pierre* and *Jean* has an unlawful lover who turns out to be the real father of *Jean*; the wife of M. *Parent* is nothing more than a harlot, the favorite of a seeming friend of her husband; in 'Notre Cœur' Mlle. *de Brune*, having been deceived in first love, becomes in turn the popular flirt and coquette of Paris, trifling with the affections of men. Nowhere in our author's novels do we find such heroines as *Little Nell*, or *Lucille*; but everywhere woman, the sweetest flower of fiction, is discounted and lowered to the level of brutes.

Equally worthy of condemnation is de Maupassant's treatment of friendship: "I am never more alone than when I open my heart to my friend" is the pithy maxim of his life. The only two men who ever associated with him after the manner of intimate companionship, Flaubert and Bouilhet, invariably found him stiff, inapproachable and formal; his novels bear no traces of ideal friendship; his personages are all wanting in that highest test of noble and honorable character, an abiding trust in human nature. For a time M. *Parent* thinks *Lemousin* his warm, bosom friend, only to have his hopes shattered by learning that his apparent friend had stolen the sacred virtue of his wife; likewise M. *Maréchal* plays M. *Roland* false.

Have de Maupassant's novels any plot? As for my part, I have read them without being

conscious of any plot whatever; it has been impossible to discover any logical coherency, any carefully elaborated system leading up to a final result—his novels consist in a simple narration of the common facts of everyday life. Contrast, if you please, the numerous characters and intricately woven scenes of the 'Old Curiosity Shop' with the simple story of 'Notre Cœur.' In the former, side issues and subordinate characters are worked in, constructed logically one upon the other, and in this wonderfully complex and complicated net-work, the hero or heroine is left to fight the battle of destiny; in the latter we lose sight of a strangely distributed environment and think only of the graphic description of one or two lives. In the former, we wonder how the hero is to extricate himself from the growing plots and scheming intrigues of his surroundings; in the latter, we wonder what unexpected and single act is to doom or save our hero.

As space forbids even a passing reference singly to the hundred stories of our author, I simply give their fivefold classification: tales of the Norman peasantry, those bearing upon the army of clerks, those representing subjects drawn from the walks of upper life, the weird and supernatural, the adventures of railway travel.*

O. M. JOHNSTON.

Johns Hopkins University.

AMERICAN DIALECT.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—I have prepared the following circular, referred to in the February number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, and shall be glad to send copies of it to anyone. The chief object of the circular is to obtain such information as will make it possible to trace, even if but vaguely, the limits of our dialect centers and currents. It may be some time before the results of the investigation can be published, but when they are, the readers of the NOTES will be inform-

*The four following articles on de Maupassant present in substance what has already been said: *Fortnightly Review*, vol. xliii, 1888, pp. 364-86, by Henry James; *New Review*, vol. v, 1891, pp. 63-71, by de Bury; *Academy*, vol. xxxix, 1891, pp. 265-66, by C. Nicholson; *Spectator*, vol. lxiii, 1889, pp. 309-10.

ed. It will be impossible for me to reply to all those that may be so kind as to contribute material. Answers to part of the questions will be acceptable, should it be inconvenient to answer all. Other information than that asked for will be gladly received, but would better be written on a separate sheet.

What is wanted is a report of natural speech, without regard to what dictionaries and teachers say is "correct." If a word or usage is in vogue only among the illiterate, mark it "I"; if only among negroes "N"; if rare "R." Please write only on one side of the paper, and number the answers as the questions are.

1. State your name and present address. 2. Where was your usage formed? [Give county and state, and add "S," "SW," "C," etc., according as the county is in the southern, southwestern, or central part of the state.] 3. Has your speech been modified by that of persons speaking differently from what is usual in your neighborhood? If so, explain. [For ex., are your parents foreigners, or from another state, or have you been taught by or associated with such persons?] 4. Where did most of the settlers in your neighborhood come from? 4½. Is there a large foreign population? If so, of what nationality?

5. Is to you the word 'stoop' (=porch) familiar, strange, or unknown? 6. Is 'bayou' to you a familiar word or a book word? 7. Does the first syllable rime with 'by' or 'bay'? 8. Does the second rime with 'go' or 'you'? 9. Are the two syllables separated by the sound of *y* in 'yet'? 10. Which syllable has the stress? 11. At what time of day do you begin to say "Good evening"? 12. Do you speak of the 'forenoon'? 13. Of the 'afternoon'? 14. Do you say "Good forenoon"? 15. "Good afternoon"? 16. Do you use 'pack' in the sense of 'carry'?

17. Does 'you all' mean 'all of you' or simply 'you'? 18. Which word has the stress? 19. Is 'you' all' used in speaking to one person? 20. Is 'yous' in use for 'you'? 21. Is 'you'n's used for 'you'? 22. Is 'yous' used in speaking to one person? 23. Is 'you'n's'? 24. Do you say "What all did he say"? 25. "Who all were there"? 26. Is 'a bunch of cattle' familiar to you? 27. Would

you say "I want up" = 'I want to get up'? 28. Would you say "The butler is all" = 'There is no more'? 29. Do you occasionally say "I guess" = 'I think'? 30. Do you occasionally say "I reckon" = 'I think'? 31. Might you say "I wonder if I shall get to go" = 'shall be able to go'? 32. Would you say "I got to go riding yesterday" = 'I had the opportunity'? 33. Do you say "I shall wait on you" = 'for you'? 34. Do you use 'carry' in the sense of 'escort'? 35. Is the word 'creek' in common use? 36. Does it usually rime with 'speak' or with 'stick'? 37. Is 'tote' to you a common word, or a comparatively recent slang word? 38. Just what does it mean? 39. Would you say "Just taste (smell, feel) of it"? 40. Or "Just taste it"?

41. Does 'to' rime with 'grow' or with 'true'? 42. Do you pronounce 'where' and 'wear,' 'whet' and 'wet' alike? 43. Has anyone ever said he thought you pronounced *wh* like *w*? 44. Do you pronounce 'excursion' with the *sh*-sound in 'shun' or that of *s* in 'vision'? 45. In which (if any) of the following does *s* have the sound of *z*: 'the grease,' 'to grease,' 'greasy'? 46. Do you pronounce *th* in the following cases as in 'thick' or as in 'the': (a) *with' em*, (b) *with' me*, (c) *with all'*? 47. Do 'thought, laught, ought, daughter, author,' etc., sound like 'hot'? 48. Does the vowel in 'law' resemble that in 'hot' or that in 'board'?

49. Which of the following words usually have *a* as in 'cat,' or nearly that? 50. Do any have a sound resembling *a* in 'make'? 50½. Do any have a sound like *a* in 'art'? 51. Do any have a sound resembling *a* in 'all'? *after, almond, answer, ant, ask, aunt, basket, calf, calm, can't, command, dance, draft, drama, fasten, gape, glass, half, haunt, laugh, ma'm* (in "yes ma'm," etc.), *nasty, past, path, plant, psalm, rather, salmon, sample, sha'n't, staff.*

52. Which is most usual: 'pa'pa,' 'papa,' 'pap,' or 'pa'? 53. If the last, does the *a* sound as in 'art,' 'hat,' or 'all'? 54. Do you say 'down' town' or 'down town'?

55. Is the word 'shilling' in use in business? If so, what is its value? 56. Is 'levy' in use? If so, what is its value? 57. Is 'bit' in use? If so, what is its value? 58. Is 'fip' in use?

If so, what is its value? 59. Do you call the pipe that conducts smoke from a stove to the chimney a "stovepipe" or a "funnel"? 60. Do you call a tin vessel of the size of a cup and with a looped tin (not long straight) handle a "tin cup" or a "dipper"? 61. Would you call an iron utensil having a large open top and used for boiling potatoes, meat, etc., a "pot" or a "kettle"? 62. If large and made of brass, what would you call it? 63. Would you call a wooden vessel for carrying water, etc., a "pail" or a "bucket"? 64. What would you call a similar vessel of tin for carrying water, milk, etc.? 65. Would you call a covered tin vessel for carrying a small amount of milk or a dinner a "pail," a "can," or a "kettle"? 66. Do you say "frying pan," "skillet," or "spider"? 67. If more than one, how do you differentiate?

What calls are used to the following animals: 68. Horses, 69. Cows, 70. Dogs, 71. Cats, 72. Pigs, 73. Sheep, 74. Chickens, 75. Ducks, 76. Geese? 77. In calling a person do you usually prefix *O*? 78. If so, is *O*! more heavily stressed or the name? 79. Do you often say 'Yes, indeed'? 80. If so, which word has most stress?

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *nymðe*, *nemne*, etc.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—The article by Professor Mather on *nemne* (MOD. LANG. NOTES for March) tempts me to bring to the light a note on the etymology of the word, that has been lurking some three years in my desk; I shall give it as I wrote it, without revision.

nefne and *nemne* are generally associated as *efne* to *emne* (cf. Kluge's and Sweet's 'Readers'), and *efne* is explained as from *ne-gif-ne* (Grein, March, Müller) or, as Heyne puts it, <*ni-iba-ni*. This might be put in somewhat more accepted form as follows:

gif <*ge-ef*=OS. *ja-ef*=Goth. *ja-iba*;

ne-ef-ne > *nefne* > *nemne* > *nemðe*,

later *ne-gif-ne* > **nifne* > *nymðe*,

the *-ðe* of the last two forms being due to the analogy of *for-pæm-ðe*, etc.

But all this is brushed aside by the fact that

nefne is a later form than *nemne*, while *nifne* does not exist. The O.E.T. contains various forms with *mn*, but not one with *fn*; while such words as *efne*, *stefne*, have not yet made the change to *mn*, but appear invariably written with *fn*.

In seeking the source of the word, we, therefore, cannot start with the *fn* form. I propose the following:—

ne-giem-pu, literally 'do not consider!' (cf. Eng. 'let alone' and German 'davon abgesehen,' 'abgesehen von,' 'ungeachtet, etc.).

> **niempu*, Sievers §110 and A.¹

> **niempe. pu* > *pe* because of weakness of accent (the word being used as a conjunction) and because no longer prevented by the independent *pu*, as the original meaning of the conglomeration was lost after the contraction of *ne giem* to *niem*; the change was probably assisted by the analogy of *for-pæm-ðe* and the other conjunctions in *-ðe*.

Later (Sievers, §97) **nympe*, **nimpe*, **nēmpē* > *nympe*, *nimpe*, *nempe*. The shortening before more than one consonant, cf. *sippan* (Kluge, Paul's 'Grd.' i., p. 868) was encouraged by the fact that conjunctions are weakly stressed. Of course, the quantity of *giem* could have no restraining influence, it being no longer associated with *niempe* in thought.

nymne, *nemne* may be due to the assimilation of *p* to *m* (*p* > *ð* > nasalized *ð* > *n*: Sievers, Paul's 'Grd.' i, p. 295, §69), perhaps assisted by the analogy of the conjunction *whonne*. Later, when *efne* had become *emne* (*b* > nasalized *b* > *m*) *nemne* was associated with it, as though *nemne*=*ne-emne*.¹ Moreover, as *emne* had the (older) by-form *efne*, there arose next *nemne* the by-form *nefne*, which was probably only an orthographic form: that is, people said *emne* but still often wrote *efne*, and so wrote *nefne*, though the word had never been so pronounced. There was no corresponding provocation to write *nysne*, and no such form appears to have arisen.

We find the following forms:—

¹ The word was archaic, occurring mostly in poetry, where prose generally has *būton*, etc. In the 'Blickling Homilies' the older word is used only three times: *nemne* 19, 22; *nempe* 161, 11; *nefne* 223, 36; against any number of *būtons*. In one of the three passages we even have *nemne būton*.

<i>nymðe,</i>	<i>nimðe,</i>	<i>nemðe,</i>
<i>nymne,</i>		<i>nemne,</i>
		<i>nefne.</i>

The O.E.T. have (besides one *nybðe*, Sievers, §187 A):—

1 <i>nymðe,</i>	2 <i>nemðe,</i>
1 <i>nymne,</i>	4 <i>nemne.</i>

(*e* predominates because most of the examples are from Mercian texts, Sievers, §159,3.)

Grein has:—

34 <i>nymðe,</i>	2 <i>nimðe,</i>	1 <i>nemðe,</i>
		8 <i>nemne,</i>
		{ 9 <i>nefne,</i>
		{ 2 <i>næfne.</i>

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

FRENCH READER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In connection with my friend Mr. Jean Passy, of Paris, I am preparing for publication a 'French Reader with Phonetic Transcription' (*Chrestomathie Phonétique*) for the use of teachers and students in private instruction, and in colleges and Romance seminaries. The American edition will be published by Henry Holt & Co., of New York.

The authors naturally wish to make their book as perfect as possible in every respect, and to offer in it some real improvements for the system of transcription, compared with previous works of a similar purport; on some doubtful points they are, therefore, anxious to know the opinions of experts, especially such as would like to use their chrestomathy. With this end in view, Mr. Jean Passy has published in the *Maître Phonétique* (March 1894, pp. 53-54) a series of questions, which I repeat below, in common print, for the consideration of those interested in the work:

1° Sera-t-il utile d'insérer dans le *French Reader* quelques textes en double transcription? Si oui, comment disposer et exécuter? (V. *Maître Phonétique*, 1893, p. 119).

2° Dans les autres textes, faut-il donner l'énonciation très contractée d'un discours rapide, ou au contraire l'énonciation un peu artificielle d'une lecture très lente? Faut-il augmenter ou réduire les (ə)? Faut-il user de parenthèses ou mieux d'italiques pour les sons qu'on peut à volonté prononcer ou omettre?

3° Comment couper les phrases? Faut-il se contenter des signes traditionnels de l'orthographe (virgule, point et virgule, deux points,

etc.) de façon à ne rien préjuger, à laisser chaque professeur libre d'indiquer à ses élèves le mode de subdivision qu'il préfère? Ou bien faut-il diviser la phrase en groupes d'énonciation?

4° Dans ce dernier cas, les groupes doivent-ils être logiques ou phonétiques? Faut-il couper d'après le sens: "la mē d mamzel; ε: me d la fij; l avi d sa fam," en s'en remettant au professeur du soin d'enseigner à l'élève à intercaler un (ə) lorsque la lenteur et les arrêts de son énonciation l'exigent? Faut-il au contraire couper d'après la syllabation du discours rapide: "la mē d mamzel; ε: me d la fij; l avi d sa fam"? Ou enfin, faut-il écrire "la mē d madmwazel, ε: me d la fij..." Quels sont, d'après votre expérience, les avantages et les inconvénients de ces quatre systèmes?

5° Les tirets qui indiquent la réunion syllabique, ont-ils une utilité réelle, ou ne servent-ils qu'à compliquer la transcription?

6° Comment marquer l'accent pour le français?—A.—En imprimant en caractères gras toutes les voyelles accentuées: *fā:te* (e).—B.—Par un trait au-dessous de la voyelle: *fā:te* (e).—C.—Par un accent au-dessus de la voyelle: *fā:té*.—D.—Par un accent avant la syllabe: *fā:'te*.—E.—Par un accent après la syllabe: *fā:te'.*

A n'offre, je crois, pas d'autre inconvénient que d'être coûteux. B et C le sont aussi, et plus compliqués pour l'œil. Comme le français est habituellement accentué sur la finale, E couperait moins les mots que D, si nous marquions chaque syllabe forte. Ce serait le contraire, si nous divisions nos textes en groupes d'énonciation, dont la dernière syllabe, presque toujours forte, peut conventionnellement se passer d'accent. À l'intérieur d'un groupe d'énonciation, c'est le plus souvent la première syllabe qui est forte, en sorte qu'on couperait moins les mots en marquant l'accent avant qu'après.

En tenant compte de ces observations, dans quel ordre de préférence rangeriez-vous les susdits systèmes?

7° Faut-il marquer les assimilation, par exemple comme ceci: *dā le: 'lsɔ̃ k̃ ʒe y l ɔ̃nɛ:r...* la *zgɔ̃:q̃ pɛrjɔd...* kwãk̃ varjabl...?

A. RAMBEAU.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE BIBLE IN PHONETIC SCRIPT.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Referring to the Review¹ of the 'Version Populaire de l'Evangile de Luc, en transcription phonétique,' I may remark that this rendition of Luke is to be followed by a similar one of the Acts of the Apostles, and later by

¹ Cf. *Le Maître Phonétique*, Avril, 1894, p. 75.

that of other books of the Bible; herein we have reason for wider interest in M. Passy's method of phonetic transcription, since it is to be employed for the propagation of a knowledge of the Bible among the uneducated peasantry of France. The author finds a motive for his undertaking in a recognition of the fact that the usual orthography for French is almost an insuperable barrier to the comprehension of any text by the average *campagnard*; another obstacle arises when the countryman essays to read the Bible; not only does the orthography bewilder him, but the language is peculiar to this Book since it consists of forms and locutions no longer in vogue in current speech, and especially in the conversation of the lower classes. The editor endeavors to overcome both of these impediments for the peasant by presenting a familiar version of the simplest of the Gospels, transcribed in his system of phonetic notation, that an illiterate person of even limited intelligence can learn in a few days, since the pronunciation indicated is colloquial and corresponds to the unaffected style of the entire work.

The outcome of this attempt will doubtless be watched by many with great interest. The present writer can testify that M. Passy has already met with marked success in teaching peasant youth (who had no previous knowledge of letters) hymns and Bible stories printed in phonetic script; while in company with the author on a visit to a Sabbath-school mission in Normandy, it was surprising to hear small boys and girls (otherwise ignorant) read with ease selections which in ordinary spelling might have offered difficulty to school-children.

The new departure may have far-reaching consequences. If children, whose families and associates are illiterate, can be readily instructed by the phonetic method, others more favored as to intellectual surroundings may learn yet more rapidly by the same plan. If the system constitutes an easy way for the French to be taught their own language, it follows that foreigners may probably find here a valuable auxiliary in mastering a tongue that is new to them; the native has for a guide a speech-feeling which is altogether wanting in the Englishman or American in his attempt

to pronounce French. All the more, then, will the latter find of great assistance a transcription in which every letter represents one definite sound, and where many signs of ordinary orthography, written but not pronounced, are omitted.

The success of the system may ultimately induce a spelling reform, but this is not necessarily implied; once having acquired a correct pronunciation by the use of the phonetic method, neither native nor foreigner will experience perplexity in recognizing words in their usual forms. Whatever may be the future results in respect to general application, both opponents and supporters of M. Passy's system will certainly be glad to witness, for the present, a prosperous issue of its extension to a new field of usefulness.

L. EMIL MENDER.

Johns Hopkins University.

OLD ENGLISH *nemne* (*nymðe*).

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—A slight confirmation of the conclusion arrived at in Dr. Mather's interesting paper on the conjunction *nemne* (*nymðe*), namely, that it was an Anglian, probably, a Mercian form, is perhaps afforded by the fact that the word occurs twice in line 258 of the Mercian Life of St. Chad which I published in the *Anglia* x, 131 (*nes nefre on his muðe nymþe crist nymþe mildheortnis*). Compare with this line 'Blickling Homilies,' 223,36 (cited by Dr. Mather).

There seems, furthermore, good reason for believing with Sievers (Paul und Braune's *Beiträge* x, pp. 474 and 483) that the metrical version of the Psalter (Paris MS.) is Anglian, not Kentish.

A. S. NAPIER.

Oxford.

ERRATUM.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—The correction, in the review of Henrici's *Iwein*—"Note on l. 3840. Read *leun* instead of *keun*" (March number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, col. 188)—is due to a misunderstanding and should be struck out.

B. J. VOS.

Johns Hopkins University.

BRIEF MENTION.

Students of the modern languages, and particularly those interested in the study of dialects, will find great attractions in the catalogue of the library of the late Prince Louis-Lucien Bonaparte (London: Henry Sotheran & Co. Price, One Guinea). Its compiler, Mr. Victor Collins, modestly terms his work an "Attempt at a Catalogue," and apologizes for errors of statement or classification, which may have been made in carrying out his laborious undertaking. For he asserts that to prepare a perfect catalogue of the library would require "several years' work for many experts." Mr. Collins has selected for his list some 13,699 numbers, which represent many more volumes, since sets and periodicals are included under one heading for each series. Some 11 numbers represent the scant amount of works on the Chinese and Thibetan languages and 66 comprise the books on African, Malay and Asiatic polyglot tongues. But with the various divisions of the Finnic dialects the list expands, and 569 numbers give an idea of their extent and variety. The Basque, to which the Prince was especially devoted, claims 713 titles; 200 more are allotted to the American, Sub-Arctic; Circassian and Semitic; and 1050 to the Aryan dialects of the East. With the Italic branch of the Aryan the richness of the collection begins to be manifest. Under the Neo-Latin languages are enumerated no less than 4291 titles, of which some 900 represent Italian dialects, and 500 more Italian in general. 1400 titles convey an idea of the amount of special works on Celtic, 2300 of the various Teutonic languages, of which Frisian claims 300, some 1500 of English, of which about 700 are absorbed by modern dialects, and the remaining 1200 describe that side of the library which relates to Slavonian, Lettic and other Aryan idioms. Criticism of the classification is entirely disarmed by the preface of the author, and, indeed, would be out of place when the labor of compiling and the purpose of the catalogue—to get a purchaser—is taken into consideration.

OBITUARY.

JOHAN FRITZNER.

By the death of Dr. Johan Fritzner, which occurred on December 10, 1893, Scandinavia has lost its most eminent lexicographer. He was born on a farm near Bergen, Norway, April 9, 1812. In 1828 he entered the University of Christiania, where he studied theology, although his chief interest was already philology, especially that of his mother tongue. After teaching for several years in Bergen, he became pastor at Vadsö, a village in Finmarken, where he was brought into close contact with the Lapps and Finns and of whose language he made himself a perfect master. It is related that he was able to preach fluently in the three languages of the district. While at Vadsö, Fritzner made his first appearance in print (1846), in a review of Stockfleth's 'Grammatik i det Lappiske Sprog.' In the same year he published an original study of the archæology of Finmarken, which may be regarded as the first step in this branch of research. His last contribution to the study of the Lapps is contained in Friis' 'Lexicon lapponicum' (1887). In the interval his activity was very great, finding expression in critical reviews, monographs, etc.

By the middle of this century the revival of interest in the study of Old Norse literature had resulted in a great collection of texts, published for the most part in Copenhagen and Christiania, the usefulness of which was vastly impaired by the absence of any complete dictionary of the language. Realizing this, the leading Old Norse scholars of Norway resolved to remedy the defect, and feeling that Fritzner was the one man of all others for the task, they requested him to undertake it. With characteristic modesty he at first refused, but in 1860 he finally began in earnest and two years later the first part appeared, the next being completed in 1867. For an account of the importance of this dictionary and the changes and improvements introduced in the second edition, of which the twenty-second part (to *skapstórr*) was published before its author's death, see MOD. LANG. NOTES vi, 8, p. 248. It is surely not out of place to mention in this brief notice of Dr. Fritzner, that his interest in language studies was never allowed to interfere with the duties of his profession, and that while he is known to the world chiefly as a diligent and incisive investigator, his memory is also cherished by his countrymen for his faithfulness and skill as a parish priest. For the materials of this account I am indebted to the sympathetic sketch in the last number of the *Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi*, written by the friend of its subject, Dr. Gustav Storm.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.